THE NEW REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOL. 110, NO. 18 NEW YORK, MONDAY, MAY 1, 1944 NUMBER 1535

Finland Must Fight

What shall Americans, who traditionally have had a sentimental attachment to Finland (mainly because she honored her war debt, and business sentiment is strong in this country), think of the Finns' rejection of the Russian peace terms? The terms are hard in some respects, but they are not so hard as an ally of Hitler had reason to expect. Finland could exist quite comfortably with the boundaries established after the recent Russo-Finnish war, and while the loss of Petsamo would naturally be regretted, the permission to keep Hangoe as a naval base is a considerable offset. The indemnity demanded was large, but presumably if that had been the only difficulty, it might have been subject to further negotiation.

What many Americans have overlooked is that German influence has been strong in Finland, and that there is a powerful native fascist movement, allied with the Nazis. If it were not so, the Finnish government would hardly have objected to the requirement that German troops be interned and eventually expelled. This would probably have meant that the Finnish army would have to fight on the other side of this war, but it would also have meant the elimination of German armed support for the Finnish reactionaries. Doubtless the Finns feared the Russian offer of aid in expelling the Germans, since they did not relish the presence of the Red Army in their country. The fact remains that they have reaffirmed their choice of sides in the world struggle against Hitlerism, and have deprived the United States and Britain of any considerable ability to protect them against the consequences of their choice.

Neutrals and Germany

The pressure against neutrals to cease aiding the Nazi war machine has had some success in Turkey, less in Sweden. While Turkey has cut off her export of chrome to the Reich, Sweden has refused to cease exporting ball bearings. This pressure did not grow strong until the Allies became certain that Germany could no longer retaliate against the proposed action by military means. But the time has now arrived when a breach of formal neutrality does not mean that the Axis is offered a new victim on a platter.

How may Sweden's action be explained? The temper of the people is strongly anti-Nazi. We cannot believe that they now entertain any serious fears of German aggression. Of course profits and employment are at stake, and the practical Swedes were never hasty to sacrifice material advantage for sentiment. Also, there is a question where Sweden would obtain the coal which Germany now sends her in exchange. We believe, however, that stronger than any other motive is Sweden's deep-seated adherence to neutrality as a principle. It has served her to keep at peace in two world wars. She wished to maintain the tradition for possible further use. It must be said that this time she had a narrow squeak, and if Germany had invaded while the power to do so existed, neutrality would have offered no more protection than it did to Norway, Denmark, Belgium or the Netherlands. Yet the tradition remains. Apparently Sweden has not been

CONTENTS

The Week 587
Editorials
The Invasion 590
Toward a World Currency 591
Keep Them in Palm Beach 592
General Articles
What Republican Trend? . . Louis H. Bean 593
Public Housing in the Doldrums . . . . . Alexander H. Crosby 595
Working at the Navy Yard . Susan B. Anthony II 597
Hell-Bent for Chaos: II . J. Donald Kingsley 599
Hill of Alabama . . . . . Potomacus 602
Washington Notes . . . . . T. R. B. 603
Behind the Beyond . . . . . Stark Young 604
The Great Brain Robbery . . Manny Farber 605
The Bandwagon 605
Correspondence 606
Reading and Writing . . . George Mayberry 608
Books in Review
The Devil a Monk Was He . Malcolm Cowley 609
Slow But Sure . . . . Nicola Chiaromonte 610
Impediments to Peace . . . Eric F. Goldman 611
Handbook of Bossism . . . Willard Wiener 612
The Men Who Make Rubber . . . . . Harold J. Ruttenberg 612
A Reader's List 613

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1944, IN THE U.S.A. BY EDITORIAL PUBLICATIONS, INC., 40 EAST 49 ST., NEW YORK 17, N. Y.
ENTERED AS SECOND-CLASS MATTER, NOVEMBER 6, 1914, AT THE POST OFFICE AT NEW YORK, N. Y., UNDER THE ACT OF MARCH 3, 1879
PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

deeply enough impressed with the United Nations' intention to prevent future wars by concerted international action. For that, the fault lies partly on our side.

The Soldiers Can't Vote

Does anybody still believe that soldiers, in important numbers, will be allowed to vote in this year's fateful presidential election? We don't. From all over the country come stories of the difficulty soldiers are having in getting ballots, and of state laws hastily being patched up, or being left in their present hopeless condition. Governor Dewey of New York State refused to have the legislature called in special session to revise the law, declaring that "we have the simplest and best soldier-vote law in the United States and it guarantees to every member of the armed forces a full ballot." Only a few days later, however, representatives of the State Election Boards were summoned to Albany for an emergency conference, called by the New York War Ballot Commission, to try to get some understanding of the New York law, "concerning which," said the letter calling the meeting, "we are so uncertain." Jim Farley, whose degree of sympathy for President Roosevelt has been dubious in the recent past, at least agrees with the President about the soldier vote. In a radio address he attacked Dewey vigorously on this issue and again appealed for a special session of the legislature. You can paste it in your hat that when the majority in Congress voted against a federal ballot it did so because it knew that nothing else would enable the soldiers to vote and it wanted to keep them from voting.

Salvemini and the Comrades

The Hollywood Writers' Congress has been trying to pretend that it is not under the control of the Communists; but it might as well now drop the effort. It gave itself away completely in its dealings a few days ago with Professor Gaetano Salvemini of Harvard University. The Communists, of course, are now an ultra-conservative group whose policy runs parallel to that of the National Association of Manufacturers. They told Professor Salvemini that he could not fulfill a proposed lecture engagement with them unless "there is a definite assurance that you do not attack the United Nations or the policies of the United States as embodied in the Atlantic Charter and the Teheran agreement." Dr. Salvemini, as everyone knows, has long been a bitter critic of American State Department policy toward Italy, and even the Department has tacitly admitted that he was right, by changing that policy. Quite properly, he told the Hollywood Writers' Congress to go to hell. We do not know who are the members of this congress; but we do know that we would not trade Dr. Salvemini, who is one of the half-dozen most heroic figures, and most courageous anti-fascists, now living, for this whole job lot of comrades, squirming in their efforts to follow the party line.

A New Tax Dodge

Would you believe that during a great war a modern democracy would sanction a strong movement to end income taxes? There is now an organization bent on this purpose, called the American Taxpayers' Association, supported by the Hearst press. Under its influence, fourteen state legislatures have passed a resolution to repeal the Sixteenth Amendment to the Constitution (which grants Congress the power to levy income taxes) and to restrict the taxing power of the federal government to a maximum of 25 percent not only on incomes, but on gifts and inheritances as well. So has the New Jersey Senate, and the proponents are hard at work in many other states. The Association in its official bulletin deplores the fact that in the few states that have turned the plan down "practical and realistic methods" were not employed to obtain a favorable vote, and believes the result would have been different "if the program had been carried on as in the past in a quiet and effective way."

Enactment of the proposed measure would mean the virtual end of progressive taxation of incomes or estates, which adjusts the burden to the capacity to bear it. A man with a net income of $5,000, paying a 25-percent tax, would have $4,000 left, while a man with an income of $1,000,000, who could not be taxed at a higher rate, would have $750,000 left. Still worse, the measure would prevent any substantial curb on the accumulation of great wealth passed on from generation to generation. In view of the cost of the war and the size of the national debt after it, the gentlemen who are trying to dodge their obligations in this way should be made to assume public responsibility by a congressional investigation of the financing and methods of the American Taxpayers' Association.

The Consumers Speak

The unique Congressional Committee for the Protection of the Consumer mobilized its supporters for the new price-control fight last week. This unofficial group of progressive congressmen, headed by Representative Thomas Scanlon (Dem., Pa.) and Representative Howard McMurray (Dem., Wis.), again called a Washington conference of representatives of organized groups all over the country concerned with holding down living costs. One hundred and seventy-five organizations from 22 states and the District of Columbia responded. Unusually strong interest was shown by veterans' and farmers' organizations. Thirty congressmen attended the sessions, held in the House Office Building, and listened to the home folks laying plans for making Congress respond to their need for real price control, now and for some time to come. The delegates visited the members of their own state

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

delegations and then went home to organize their communities for a national "price-control week," May 17-24, further to impress Congress with the fact that the people mean business on this issue.

The House and Lend-Lease

The vote by which the House of Representatives approved extension of Lend-Lease for another year (334 to 21) was, on the surface, an encouraging one. But there were fifteen more negative votes this time than there were a year ago. And close reading of the two days of debate on the issue was even more disconcerting. All of those who voted against continuing Lend-Lease this time were Republicans from the Middle West except Representative Daniel Reed (Dem., N. Y.). Their ideas on foreign policy seem to have changed little if at all from their pre-Pearl Harbor isolationism. Voters who are inclined to shrug off the position of these men before we entered the war might do well to read The Congressional Record for April 17 and April 18, 1944.

Ham Fish used a major part of the debate time allotted to the Republicans to repeat his argument against our taking part in this war, and to malign the administration's original intent in undertaking the Lend-Lease program. Representative Edith Nourse Rogers (Rep., Mass.) proposed an amendment designed to tighten congressional control over Lend-Lease to the Soviet Union because, she said, "Nobody knows whether these countries who are now our allies will be our allies after the war is finished." Mrs. Rogers and Ham Fish both asked that Herbert Hoover be named to administer a food program for the children of Europe. Representative William P. Elmer (Rep., Mo.) stood up to echo the rumor which Radio Tokyo has been spreading for weeks, that the Russians are trading United States Lend-Lease goods to Japan. Representative Calvin Johnson mouthed the old, exploded rumors about British misuse of Lend-Lease over again. There were two days of it. The trouble-makers have not reformed, in case you had any doubts. All of them are up for reëlection this year.

South Carolina's Dodge Won't Work

South Carolina is now engaged in abolishing all laws having to do with primary elections. The Supreme Court, in its recent decision permitting Negroes to vote in Texas, laid a good deal of stress on the fact that in that state the primaries are an integral part of the electoral process; South Carolina has decided that by making the primaries just a private family affair, it can escape the net in which Texas is caught.

The chances are, however, that the South Carolinians are wasting their effort. Four years ago, the present Chief Justice forestalled their ingenious plan in his opinion in United States v. Classic, from which the recent Texas decision was derived. Said Mr. Justice Stone:

> Where the state law has made the primary an integral party of the procedure of choice, or where in fact the primary effectively controls the choice, the right of an elector to have his ballot counted at the primary is likewise included in the right protected by Article I, par. 2.

It is reasonable to assume that the new South Carolina policy will be taken to the Supreme Court, and that the Court will throw it out, as it did the machinery in Texas. The "white-supremacy" boys will have to try another tack, so far as the law is concerned.

The Court Is Trusting

The United States Supreme Court showed an extraordinary trust in human nature in a recent decision affecting the Soft Lite Lens Company. This firm had been charged by the government with control of resale prices of its product. It had a system of exclusive dealer licenses; no retailer was licensed unless his wholesaler guaranteed that he would play ball; and not a pair of lenses was sold without a numbered "protection certificate" through which Soft Lite could identify both retailer and wholesaler, just in case they should decide to sell at a lower price than Soft Lite thought was proper. The Court agreed with the government that the system was unlawful; but it then, inexplicably, prohibited use of the plan for only six months. Thereafter, Soft Lite will be allowed again to enter "fair-trade" agreements with its former distributors. The government, not unnaturally, wanted a permanent injunction, and wanted the company ordered to sell to anybody who was prepared to buy. The Court, however, saw "no reason to doubt that the Soft Lite Company will conform meticulously to the requirement of the decree." Perhaps somebody ought to take the Court aside and tell it the Facts of Life.

Fitzpatrick in The St. Louis Post-Dispatch

Bright Sword, But a Tattered Banner

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Invasion

THE WAR IS about to begin. This may seem a churlish commentary on the 44,000 American dead who have fallen thus far, on the thousands of wounded, maimed, prisoners, on the victories we have won in the Mediterranean theatre and the Far Eastern naval and island fronts. And for the Russians, certainly, the war began long ago and is well on its way to the climactic phases.

Yet it is true that, for the Americans and the British, everything that has happened thus far in the war has been but a prelude to the real thing which is now about to begin—the invasion of the enemy's strongholds on the Continent. If that fails, the forces that are pressing for a negotiated peace will be immensely strengthened. If it succeeds—as it must—the Nazi power will be crushed beyond any revival in our generation.

We are on the eve of invasion. But it would be a foolhardy prophet who would seek to put his finger on its exact timing. There are all sorts of rumors current, in Washington and London and New York. You can always meet the fellow who just had it from someone who was told by someone who knows someone right at the top: and he will tell you that the invasion will start on the third Wednesday of blank month, at four a.m., just in time for the morning editions so you can read about it at breakfast. But anyone who will give it a second thought knows that in an invasion so long and carefully prepared there must have been elaborated a technique of concealing the timing, and that all these rumors are a carefully planned part of the technique. None of us can tell when the various signs that seem to point to an immediately pending invasion are false leads, and when they are the thing itself. And it would be best to stop guessing.

But while the timing is beyond our calculation, the nature of the task to be confronted is not. The pattern of the preliminaries to the invasion is pretty clear. It has four main phases.

One is the softening of the enemy from the air, and the disruption of his war production and his communication lines. This is now going on at a steadily heightened pace, and the most recent American and British air attacks on German cities and on the invasion coast have met with decreased fighter resistance and have suffered relatively light losses. This may argue that the enemy's air strength has been considerably weakened, or that he is nursing it—but either way it augurs well.

The second is the diplomatic front, where efforts are still being made to detach the satellite countries from the enemy, and either win over or isolate the neutrals. The progress here has not been as great as was hoped for some months back. Bulgaria has not yet been detached, Hungary has come under the complete occupation of Hitler's forces to keep her in the war, the Finnish-Russian peace negotiations have been broken off. Only from Rumania does talk still come of a separate peace. Turkey, which once seemed on the verge of entering the war on our side, is still a neutral—although her newest decision to stop chrome shipments to Germany shows that she is still betting on the success of the invasion. The Anglo-American attitude to Spain seems to be to apply just enough pressure to force a somewhat less hostile neutrality from her, but not enough to overthrow Franco's government. The steps taken by the British in isolating Ireland and in placing a ban on all secret diplomatic communications are signs that the invasion preparations have entered the stage in which spying by presumably neutral governments could prove fatal.

The third is the war of nerves against the enemy. Since the preparations for the invasion attempt cannot be concealed from him, the war of nerves has taken the form of surplus publicity. And along with it is the war of propaganda leaflets showered down on German centers, and radio broadcasts aimed at the German people.

The fourth phase is political warfare aimed to enlist and organize the underground organizations in occupied Europe. Unfortunately the blunders in our Spanish, French and Italian policy have cut down on the effectiveness of this political warfare. An underground, moreover, needs not only enthusiasm but weapons—and the reports are that only one man out of twenty in the French underground is now armed.

This is a summary only of the preparatory phases. The invasion itself is likely to involve thrusts at many points instead of just one, partly to scatter the enemy's defensive strength, partly to explore pragmatically the points at which a bridgehead can be established and held. The enemy will try to use his air strength to bombard the invasion ports, and his air and naval strength to attack the invasion fleet. His fortifications on the invasion coast are probably very strong, but his numerical strength there is spread very thin—thanks to the terrible losses the Russians have inflicted on the German armies, and the number of German divisions that are still tied down on the Russian front.

The crucial test of the invasion is likely to come when the enemy launches his counter-attack on the bridgeheads we have established. It has been estimated that the Germans have from twenty to thirty of their best divisions reserved for this attack. And here we must be prepared to sustain heavy losses—heavier even than the losses in the invasion landings proper.

Yet those who are overpessimistic on this score would do well to remember that once we have met and defeated this counter-attack, the worst of the war will be over. As Max Werner has put it in a recent PM article, it will not be necessary for us to drive to Berlin in order to win the victory. The decision will come not with the siege and reduction of Berlin, but with the breaking of the German counter-offensive. It is the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

twenty or thirty mobile divisions of the Germans that must be beaten. When that has been done, the static divisions in the interior of the fortress will be doomed to a hopeless siege or a series of drastic encirclements.

It has been said, and largely from German sources, that the present lull in the Russian advances is due to the Russian preparations to synchronize their next major blows with the Anglo-American invasion. This may be true, but it is just as capable of being explained in other terms. The Russians have moved forward in recent weeks at an almost incredible rate of speed. This would be a logical time for them to regroup their forces, strengthen their supply lines and prepare for the next blows. Their lull does not necessarily mean that the cross-Channel invasion is coming soon.

But in a deeper sense there is already an organic relation between the Russian strength and the chances of the Allied invasion. Were it not for the Russian strength the success of the invasion would be much more conjectural than it is. For it is the fact that the Russians are holding down and battering two-thirds of the German land forces and half of their air force, which makes it impossible for Hitler to withdraw his major strength to the west. If he could do it, the mobile divisions he would be able to muster for the counter-offensive after the Allied landings would be immense. He dare not do it, because he is just as fearful of a thrust to Berlin from the east as from the west and south. This is the agony of the Nazi military fortunes.

When the invasion comes, its immediate psychological effect on Americans is likely to be sharp and drastic. We shall learn that there is a war on. The spite politics and the home-front sabotage that today dominate the American scene will look mean and petty. But the great question is whether the shock will last, and whether the war against the President will cease or only suffer a lull.

Toward a World Currency

THE EXPERTS of the United Nations have agreed on the principles for stabilization of exchanges after the war; these principles are to be submitted to a future meeting of official delegates who can accept, reject or modify them. The principles are closer to the White plan of the United States Treasury than to the Keynes plan originally drafted to represent the British point of view. The basis of the scheme is a stabilization fund composed of gold, and contributed by the members, rather than a clearing house of the traditional banking sort. Safeguards are included to make sure that neither Britain nor any other country can draw on the fund too far beyond the amount of its contributions, while the contribution of the United States, which probably will not need to draw on the fund heavily, is reasonably limited. This goes far to allay the fear expressed about the Keynes plan, namely, that Britain would employ a scheme ostensibly devised to stabilize exchanges in order to counterbalance its heavy loss of foreign investments, and hence of incoming payments.

Two major arguments formerly put forward for the Keynes plan require comment, in view of the principles now adopted. One was that since a straight clearing-house scheme, not tied to a gold reserve, would be capable of expanding indefinitely according to the needs of trade, Lord Keynes's suggestion was more in accord with the need for stimulating an expanding economy after the war. The other was that it included positive suggestions for bringing about the necessary expansion of trade and investment whenever the currency-stabilization machinery itself indicated by signs of strain that the basic trouble lay in sufficient economic activity rather than merely in short-run monetary irregularities. Concerning the first, it may be said that the world's gold supply is now ample, and bids fair to be large enough for years to come, so that it need have no deflationary influence. Concerning the second, the announcement accompanying the new plan indicates that a companion plan for a world investment bank is in the offing, to do under a separate agency much of what the Keynes plan proposed in order to encourage expansion.

Fundamental to the whole subject is a recognition that no scheme to stabilize exchange by buying and selling currencies can long succeed any better than the old international gold standard if there remain persistent lacks of balance in international payments. As long, for instance, as the rest of the world owes the United States more than the United States owes the rest of the world, and tries to pay its debts, any international fund controlling exchange rates can do little more than cushion for a while the pressure of demand which drives the dollar up in terms of the currencies of the debtor nations. Before the war, we collected the balance in gold as long as the paying nations had any gold, and when their gold ran out, they imposed exchange controls, or depreciated their currency, or both. They could scarcely do otherwise. An international exchange stabilization fund, the members of which promise not to impose exchange control or to depreciate their currencies, will eventually reach its limits in controlling such a situation. It can absorb short-run irregularities, but can do little more than call attention to and dramatize a long-run imbalance.

There are remedies which may be applied to such fundamental maladjustments, but they lie outside the realm of currency manipulation. They imply the utmost freedom of trade, access by all to raw materials, acceptance by the creditor nations of the necessity either to have an excess of imports or to invest their surpluses abroad and, above all, expanding production and consumption on a worldwide scale. No solution is

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

possible so long as the world suffers severe depressions and trade shrinks.

On this account, while we welcome the steps toward agreement on machinery for currency stabilization, we are far more deeply concerned by the signs of an intention to resume and strengthen economic nationalism on the part of powerful groups in both the United States and Britain. There are those in this country who wish, not only to hold all domestic markets against possible imports, but to do the world's shipping business, to be masters of the air and to own the world's oil. Naturally this stimulates the protectionist groups in Britain to demand the continuance of imperial preference and safeguard economic imperialism at every point. Competition among private business concerns is desirable, but competition among nations leads to restrictions on trade adopted in the supposed interests of the respective nationals, and this in turn leads to the dwindling of trade as a whole. If this tendency continues after the war, the aspirations for freedom from want will go glimmering, to say nothing of any aspiration for a stable world currency.

Keep Them in Palm Beach

SOMETHING VERY QUEER is going on between the Florida East Coast Hotel Corporation and the United States War Department. The War Department about eighteen months ago took over the Breakers Hotel, at Palm Beach, owned by the corporation, as a hospital for soldiers requiring plastic and neurosurgery. For this the site is ideal: the climate is perfect, the hotel is better suited for hospital use than many buildings erected for that specific purpose; it has nine sundecks, a salt-water swimming pool, and is close to the ocean. But the idle rich of Palm Beach (with some honorable exceptions) don't want the sight of wounded veterans to spoil their good times. They protested violently; and for this or some other reason, the army proposes to close down the hospital and send the men somewhere else. This would break up a well functioning team of doctors and nurses, and put the patients into the hands of strangers, delaying their recovery, since morale is an important factor in these cases.

The army gives the official explanation that it couldn't come to terms with the owners of the hotel; but this is nonsense. The army is not required to pay, for any property, whatever the owner happens to ask. Nobody ever heard of its abandoning any other building because of disagreement over price.

The army says the patients are to be removed "to the permanent army hospitals nearest their homes. Thus they will have an opportunity to entertain their families and friends." This is in flat contradiction to another official report which says the men are to go to Atkinson, Indiana. With all respect to Indiana, its winter climate is far inferior to that of Palm Beach. We have reliable evidence that many of the men in the hospital are depressed at the thought of removal.

The army says it doesn't need this hospital any longer, which is plainly ridiculous. Out of 250 hospitals, only two are being abandoned, and there are special reasons in the case of the second one, located in the Pacific Northwest. All veterans get hospital service free of charge, and they are now leaving the service at the rate of 100,000 a month. The army has no oversupply of hospital beds now—especially with the invasion about to begin—and will probably soon be badly underequipped.

This particular Palm Beach hospital, known now as the Ream, is strategically located, only a few miles from the United States airport to which wounded men are first brought back from India, Africa, Southern Europe and South America. It could be bought outright for only about $3,000,000 now, and could be resold again at a handsome profit after the war.

One of the oddities of the Breakers affair, by the way, is the Incident of the Suppressed Report. The able and crusading young Assistant Attorney General, Norman Littell, was asked to make a study of the whole situation, which he did; we understand that he warmly endorsed keeping the hospital. The Truman Committee asked to see his report; and according to Drew Pearson, Attorney General Biddle first asked the committee to withdraw its request, and then announced that since the report had not been requested, it would not be sent over. Thereupon both the Truman and the Kilgore Committees subpoenaed the report—upon which the Attorney General asked them to keep it confidential. We cannot believe that the Attorney General, for whom we have high respect, is playing the game of the Florida East Coast Hotel Corporation and the idle rich of Palm Beach. We hope he will promptly explain his action; and we hope, too, that the War Department will act to clear away a similar suspicion in regard to itself.

THE NEW REPUBLIC
A Journal of Opinion

Editors: BRUCE BLIVEN, MALCOLM COWLEY, GEORGE SOULE, MICHAEL STRAIGHT, STARK YOUNG

Treasurer: DANIEL MEBANE

Assistant Editors: ELIZABETH HULING, GEORGE MAYBERRY

Contributing Editors: H. N. BRAILSFORD, VAN WYCK BROOKS, VARIAN FRY, JULIAN HUXLEY, ALFRED KAZIN, MAX LERNER, E. C. LINDEMAN, THOMAS SANCTON, REXFORD GUY TUGWELL

Advertising Manager: E. G. WOOD

SINGLE COPIES, FIFTEEN CENTS; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, FIVE DOLLARS; CANADIAN SUBSCRIPTION, SIX DOLLARS; FOREIGN, SIX DOLLARS; THREE MONTHS' TRIAL, ONE DOLLAR

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

What Republican Trend?

THE AVERAGE VOTER, without access to detailed political facts, continues to be puzzled by the conflicting claims concerning the political tide. Republicans point to these evidences of a tide in their favor; in the presidential election of 1936, the Democrats cast as much as 62 percent of the two-major-party vote, they lost a substantial number of seats in the 1938 congressional election; they cast only 55 percent of the total two-party vote in 1940, they cast only 48 percent of the vote in 1942 and lost more seats in Congress, and since then they have lost three local congressional and three gubernatorial elections.

The Democrats continue to counter with the argument that was given by Vice President Wallace in November, 1942, when he pointed out that the 1942 Republican congressional victories were produced largely by the fact that only about half of the 1940 electorate took time out to vote. They point to even greater falling off in participation in the local elections of 1943 and 1944, in many cases a remarkable shrinkage almost to the vanishing point. And they argue this record low participation has completely obscured the national trend. With the lifting of political apathy in the presidential campaign, they say, the total vote will be much larger, the Democratic share will also be greater, and probably it will not be much different from that of 1940.

Are the Republicans right in taking at face value the impressive record of recent local victories, or are the Democrats right in their view that the unusually low participation obscures their real strength?

As one of the perplexed, I have assembled the statistical records for the local elections that have taken place since November, 1942, and present them here to the readers of The New Republic (as I did in a similar analysis of the political tide in 1940), in the hope that they may be of some interest.

There is a common pattern in the political record of the past few years which has been reproduced in practically all recent local elections. In spite of differences in local issues, conditions and personalities, the common pattern of declining participation has been the outstanding feature since 1940. In each case, except one, the falling off has been associated with a decline in the Democratic share of the vote cast.

The record is one of political apathy amazing even for local elections. In some cases, as for example in the Twenty-first Congressional District in New York in March, 1944, 80 to 90 percent or more of those who voted either Republican or Democratic in 1936 and 1940 failed to participate in the elections. In most cases, the falling off in turnout has been greater among Democrats than among Republicans, resulting in an increase in the Republican percentage of the two-party vote, but inasmuch as the falling off has been great among both parties, it cannot be argued that the recent Republican gains with small turnout mean that Democrats have been staying away because they are anti-Democratic.

As an example of this pattern let us take one of the first local congressional elections following the national congressional elections of 1942. Early in 1943, the Second Congressional District in Kansas, normally Republican, elected the Republican candidate. In 1942, Republicans in this district cast only 49,000 votes compared with 70,000 in the previous three elections (1936, 1938, 1940), but in 1943, fewer than 20,000 Republicans participated—a shrinkage of more than 70 percent. The Democrats, who cast 55,000 to 63,000 votes in 1936-1940, cast only 34,000 in 1942, and less than 9,000 in 1943—a shrinkage of about 85 percent. Here is the way the total turnout was reflected in the Democratic percentage:

	Total Vote	*Percent Democratic*
1936	132,087	45.5
1938	125,190	43.6
1940	136,446	46.0
1942	82,219	40.9
1943	28,657	31.0

This is essentially also the pattern in the Sixth District of Missouri, where a congressional election was held in January, 1943, which was described to New Republic readers as evidence of the Republican tide. In 1936-38-40, the total vote here was respectively 140,000, 105,000 and 147,000, and the corresponding Democratic percentage, 53, 51 and 47. Because of the reaction to the war in this area, the larger 1940 vote gave the Democrats a smaller percentage than in 1938, but as participation fell off to 84,000 in 1942 and to 55,500 in 1943, the Democratic percentage fell to 37.

This pattern was repeated in New York State. Of 5,500,000 votes cast for President in 1936, 60 percent were Democratic; of 4,700,000 votes in the 1938 congressional election, 51 percent were Democratic; of the 6,300,000 votes in the presidential election of 1949, 52 percent were Democratic (the percentage being held down in large part by the adverse reaction to the war situation in certain metropolitan districts). The vote for Governor in 1942 brought out only 4,000,000 voters, with 47 percent Democratic, and the vote for Lieutenant-Governor fell off even more—to 3,300,000—with 45 percent Democratic. The upstate vote revealed the typical pattern more strikingly than the New York City vote. In New York City, Democrats cast 75 percent of the vote in 1936, and 65 percent in

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

1938, but in spite of a declining turnout, the Democrats had 61 percent in 1940, 62 in 1942 and 61 in 1943, thus holding their position stable since 1940.

The upstate New York record follows strikingly the experience in the Second District of Kansas; 2,800,000 votes in 1936, 2,400,000 in 1938, 3,100,000 in 1940, and the corresponding Democratic percentages, 45, 38 and 42; the 1942 vote went down to 2,100,000, and the 1943 vote to only 1,800,000, and the Democratic percentages dropped to 34 and 32 respectively.

In addition to the gubernatorial vote in New York, the races for Governor in New Jersey and Kentucky were considered important political events in 1943. A different set of years is involved in the background records for these two elections, but the participation factor again stands out in spite of the diversity in situations and personalities. In the 1931, 1935 and 1939 gubernatorial elections in Kentucky, 800,000 to 1,000,000 votes were cast, and the Democratic candidate received 55 to 57 percent of the vote; in the 1927 election, somewhat less than 800,000 votes were cast and the Democratic candidate received 48 percent, and again in 1943, with an even smaller vote than in 1927 (550,000), the Democratic candidate lost by half a point, 49.5 percent. The New Jersey record shows the Democratic gubernatorial candidate winning, with 52 percent of the 1,450,000 vote in 1937, and the 1,900,000 vote of 1940, but losing in 1934, with 49 percent of a vote somewhat less than 1,400,000, and losing again in 1943, with 44 percent of the substantially smaller vote of 1,150,000.

One other congressional election in 1943 should be noted before we look at the congressional elections so far in 1944. The one exception to the general rule of declining participation with declining Democratic strength occurred in the Fourth District of Kentucky, where a larger turn-out was accompanied by a smaller Democratic percentage. Since we are not discussing issues, conditions and personalities in the other cases, we do not need to do so here.

So far in 1944 there have been several additional congressional elections, in Pennsylvania, in New York City, in Colorado, and the most recent one in Oklahoma. With the interesting exception of the Oklahoma election, the 1944 experience, so far, corroborates that of 1942 and 1943.

In the Second Congressional District of Pennsylvania, total participation in 1940, 1942 and in January, 1944, fell off as follows: 102,000, 72,000 and 44,000. The 1940 Democratic percentage was 61.4, the 1942 percentage 50.5 and the January, 1944, percentage, 44. In the Seventeenth District of Pennsylvania, usually Republican, the shrinkage was even greater, from 121,000 in 1942 to only 27,000 in January, 1944, and the Democratic percentage fell from 37 to 17.

In the First District of Colorado, the decline in participation in the 1940, 1942 and 1944 elections runs as follows: 170,000, 108,000 and 80,000—about as much of a decline as in the Second District of Pennsylvania—and the Democratic percentages also decline in like manner, namely, 65, 54 and 48.

In the Twenty-first District of New York, the recent falling off in participation was much more drastic than in the Pennsylvania and Colorado instances. Here the 1940 two-party vote was 154,000; the 1942 total was 91,000; and the March, 1944, total a mere 22,000, with Democratic percentages of 70, 66 and 54.

The latest Oklahoma experience makes it possible to sharpen the central inference from these records. If the general decline in Democratic percentages is due to declining participation, it may be argued that where there is no decline to speak of, the percentage should show no material change, and where there is an increase in participation, the Democratic percentage may be expected to increase. We have two cases where participation has been held at about the 1942 figure; and here we do find support for the inference that participation is the central key to an understanding of the Democratic-Republican balance. The recent Oklahoma election showed no material falling off in participation from that of 1942. The participation record here is 81,000 for 1940, 43,000 for 1942 and 39,000 for 1944, and the corresponding Democratic percentages are 62, 50.5 and 54. The fact that the Democratic percentage actually improved with no material change in participation may be taken as evidence that there has been a real increase in Democratic strength since 1942, but the statistical margin of certainty is small.

The only other case where participation has been held comparatively stable, resulting in a relatively steady Democratic-Republican balance, is Albany, New York. In this county, the drop in participation between 1940 and 1943 was only 17 percent, compared with about a 50-percent decline for the state as a whole, and the Democratic percentage was held at 56.1 in 1943, compared with 55.6 in 1940.

These records show not only the general fact that a falling off in participation has been a most important factor in the seeming decline in Democratic strength during 1942-43, but also that differences in the extent of decline have produced differences in the extent of Democratic losses or Republican gains. The five elections so far in 1944 may be used to point up this fact. If we compute the percentage decline in participation between 1942 and 1944, and compare with the change in the Democratic percentage between those two years, we get the following:

Election in	*Percent Decline in Participation*	*Change in Democratic Percentage*
Pennsylvania, 17th District	— 78	— 20
New York, 21st District	— 66	— 12
Pennsylvania, 2nd District	— 39	— 7
Colorado, 1st District	— 26	— 6
Oklahoma, 2nd District	— 7	+ 4

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Note that the greatest shrinkages in participation, 78 and 66 percent, which occurred in the Seventeenth District of Pennsylvania, and the Twenty-first District of New York, showed the greatest declines in Democratic strength; the smaller declines in Pennsylvania and Colorado brought smaller losses, while the smallest decline was accompanied by an improvement in strength.

The statistical consistency of these records and these relationships warrants one further observation, not in the nature of a forecast, but rather as to what might have been. The Republicans took the lieutenant-governorship from the Democrats in New York, the governorships of New Jersey and Kentucky, and the congressional seats in the Second District of Pennsylvania and the First District of Colorado. Judging entirely from the records, it may be said that:

The Democratic candidate for Lieutenant-Governor might have been elected in New York had the state turnout been one million greater than it was (30-percent increase).

The Democratic candidate for Governor in Kentucky might have been elected with an additional turnout of about 50,000 (10-percent increase).

The Democratic candidate for Governor in New Jersey might have been elected with perhaps no more than an additional 250,000 votes (20-percent increase).

The Democratic candidate in the Second Congressional District of Pennsylvania might have been elected with an additional turnout of 22,000 (50-percent increase).

The Democratic candidate in the First Congressional District of Colorado might have been elected with an additional turnout of 7,000 (10-percent increase).

These dozen straws do not of course tell us exactly where the national political tide is, whether on the Republican or the Democratic side. Some of these votes record Republican victories, others represent reduced Democratic margins. They do, however, justify the conclusion that the present Democratic-Republican balance in local elections is not indicative of what it is likely to be in the presidential issue. Invariably turnouts in presidential elections exceed turnouts in congressional elections. The American Institute of Public Opinion finds that about 40,000,000 voters expect to participate in this year's presidential election, compared with only 28,000,000 in 1942, but 50,000,000 in 1940. It finds further that with this increase in turnout of about a third over that of 1942, the Democratic percentage would rise from 48, in the congressional elections of 1942, to 52. The Fortune Poll indicates the present Democratic-Republican balance as 56 percent for a Democratic President. The total vote this year would normally be close to 53,000,000.

Whether the political tide this fall is to be judged at the lower or upper figure in the two polls would, according to the records presented here, depend in large part on whether the total vote can be made to exceed 40,000,000.

LOUIS H. BEAN

Public Housing in the Doldrums

A FEW WEEKS AGO photographers hurried to the home of Mrs. Irene Kelly on a little alley half a mile from the heart of Pittsburgh. The Kelly family was nationwide news. Sergeant Charles E. Kelly had killed 40-odd Germans and was the first enlisted man to win the Congressional Medal of Honor in this war. His widowed mother's prayer for a furlough had been answered.

When Pittsburgh city editors saw the pictures of what was euphemistically described as "the modest Kelly home," they tore them up. The house was a rotting frame structure. The Kellys' three rooms, reached by an outside plank stairway to the second and third floors, had no electricity, gas or bathroom. Out-of-town papers did publish the picture of Mrs. Kelly on her doorstep and thus it happened that Dr. Bryn J. Hovde, able administrator of the Pittsburgh Housing Authority, promptly offered the Kellys a modern low-rent dwelling. Ironically, only a few months earlier the Pittsburgh city council had turned down the housing authority's request for a loan of $40,000. The money was to finance postwar plans for more low-rent housing in the city's extensive slum areas.

There are 18,000,000 American families in homes little better or even worse than the Kelly house. Almost one-half of the nation is housed in buildings that have no bathroom or need major repairs. Unless the labor and liberal movements punch a lot harder than either is doing now, it will take a Congressional Medal of Honor to get these families into decent dwellings at rents they can afford.

The hard fact, as Helen Fuller revealed in the April 3 issue of The New Republic, is that private real estate's powerful lobby is working relentlessly to kill the public housing program—a program which in 10 years has yielded the modest total of 154,189 homes for low-income families. Since this is such a small fraction of the total job and since public housing is never built for families who can afford good private homes, why the hysteria?

One reason is that public housing has been remarkably successful as far as it has gone and gives little promise of succumbing to unsound theory or bad

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

administration. A second is that enemies of the administration are looking under every stone for anti-Roosevelt propaganda. A third is that public housing does compete, in one sense, with private housing. By dispensing with profit, by utilizing small subsidies and by developing economical management methods, a local housing authority offers for $12 a month a home that a private landlord would rent for $35 or more. Obviously this kind of business tends to be subversive.

An item that should count heavily for public housing in the sharpening fight is the complete failure of the private enterprisers to put forth a reasonable alternative to subsidized low-rent housing. After several bad tries, the real-estate lobby is still empty-handed. Last November the National Association of Real Estate Boards and its satellites declared for the old rent-certificate formula, which would require every ill housed family to go on relief. The taxpayers would put up the difference between the rent the family could afford and the price asked by the landlord. Most probable result would be that slum landlords would summon the painter and the plumber for the first time in years and the $14 rathole would become a deluxe rathole at $30, with the public contributing the $16 difference. Lest this conclusion appear unjust to landlords, be it remembered that the many millions paid for relief clients' rents in the past decade have produced no measurable improvement in housing.

Even the real-estate dealers were cool to the rent-certificate plan. The next proposal of NAREB was an amazing scheme for federal income-tax exemption to facilitate slum clearance and new construction. Money invested for these purposes would be tax-exempt and so would the returns. Senator Allen J. Ellender of Louisiana tested the plan and found that in spite of the big federal tax subsidy, a $4,000 house on a $2,000 lot in a central area would rent for about $45—as compared with $16 for an identical dwelling built by a local housing authority under the United States Housing Act formula. Slum families will not find salvation in $45 rents.

The top men of private real estate are not only willing but eager to subvert free enterprise if they can get the subsidies while the government takes their risk. Whether they succeed depends largely upon the friends of public housing, who have finally discovered that they must fight to maintain social progress.

One heartening sign is the emergence of the National Public Housing Conference as an organization capable of building grassroots support. But the national and local leaders of public housing must do a great deal more than organize. They must declare for bold objectives. At its recent annual meeting the NPHC took a first step by advocating the construction of 22,500,000 private and public dwellings in the 15-year period after the war. Slum inhabitants will not be rehoused in a generation unless at least half of such a program is low-rent housing, yet many public-housing supporters still modestly insist that much the greater portion of the job belongs to private enterprise—which can build profitably for slightly less than one-half of the population.

A second essential is a closer relationship with labor, the strongest natural ally of public housing. Most housing leaders see this need, but an influential minority still looks under the bed for CIO organizers and merely tolerates AFL representatives, thus rendering a notable service to the National Association of Real Estate Boards.

Third, public housing must rekindle that oldtime religious fervor. NAREB is wrong in saying that the movement consists of vested jobholders, but how many hands are reaching for the torch carried by Edith Elmer Wood, Helen Alfred, Mary K. Simkhovitch, Catherine Bauer and Nathan Straus? The fact is that public-housing jobs do pay well and there is a temptation to maintain a comfortable status quo by intramural politicking rather than hard campaigning on the social battlefront. More than one local official has executed a detaching movement under pressure from the opposition. The need is for men and women who fight harder when attacked.

Fourth, public housing must broaden its horizon. Perhaps the greatest weakness is the lack of coöperatively managed housing to serve the big segment of the population with incomes too high for admission to subsidized low-rent dwellings yet too low to meet the price of decent private housing. Many labor-union members are in this no-man's-land, and public housing will get no real support from them until it promises something in return.

It would be wrong to suggest that all the friends of public housing should gird for mortal combat with all the people who have a stake in private enterprise. The lines of economic and social partisanship are blurred. Many real-estate men are sincere participants in the public-housing program; many officials of the public-housing movement are former real-estate men and bankers. There is a great deal of support within the public-housing movement for the National Housing Agency's philosophy of a coördinated public and private attack on the housing problem and in many communities the local housing authority and the local real-estate board are on the best of terms. The clearest thinkers in public housing argue that it is far more important to rehouse the Kelly family than to quarrel over who should lay the first stone. That is true. It is also true that until the public-housing movement makes itself strong enough to beat down the reactionary national leadership of private real estate—a leadership that often fails to reflect the sentiments of the small dealer—no workable agreement on division of the field will be possible.

ALEXANDER L. CROSBY

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Working at the Navy Yard

My first night on the midnight shift at the Washington Navy Yard, I met Esther, a fellow ordnance worker, who ran the machine next to mine. Dreading the changeover from swing shift to "graveyard," I asked Esther's advice on the best hours for eating and sleeping after 8 a. m.

"When do you go to bed?" I asked.

"Bed!" exclaimed Esther, a swarthy woman of about 35. "I haven't slept in a bed for five months."

Esther, the mother of five children, then told me the seemingly unbelievable schedule she has followed for the five months she has been working on ordnance to pad her husband's daily wage of $4.83, made as a trucker on the railroad.

"I have to run out of here to catch my bus at 8:10 in the morning so I can get home right after he leaves for work," said Esther. "I see that the three older kids are dressed OK for school and have had something to eat. Then I feed the little ones. Tommy is four and Mary is almost three. I feed myself and wash the dishes, straighten up the house, wash if I have to and take the kids out with me to buy groceries. Then I give the little ones lunch and make some sandwiches for the kids that go to school.

"After lunch I try to get some sleep—not in bed though—I just sit in a big chair in the living room and prop my feet up. Have you ever tried getting to sleep and staying asleep while watching two little kids tear the house apart?"

I could only look at Esther's tired face and wonder how many more months she could continue on such a regime. Next month, Tommy will go to half-day kindergarten. There are no nursery schools in the neighborhood for Mary, however, and the only one near the navy yard has a waiting list of 40 children.

Two nights after my talk with Esther, I came in at midnight and found her the center of a buzzing, indignant group of women workers.

"Esther's house almost caught fire this morning," explained Louise excitedly. "The new ruling that we have to take our coats all the way down to the ladies' room at the far end of the shop instead of hanging them in here, made Esther lose her bus. When she got home the kids were fooling with the gas stove and a towel had already caught fire."

The master mechanic, head of the shop, had decreed that we must take a ten-minute round-trip walk to hang up our coats. This meant that women workers had to get to work ten minutes earlier and were delayed ten minutes afterwards.

"Why can't we have lockers right up here near the elevator, like most of the men?" protested one of women.

This led to a petition asking for conveniently located lockers which we planned to get all the women in the shop to sign and then present to the master mechanic. Only four of us had a chance to sign it, however, before a personnel man on his daily check-up rounds, picked it up and turned it over to the master mechanic. We four were called on the carpet.

"Your request for lockers is ridiculous and will never be granted," he said. "Don't ever let me hear another word of this."

Two of the women who had signed were immediately transferred from our room. I was threatened with disciplinary action and was asked to explain my conduct in writing. I did explain. I protested the women's lack of representation on any grievance body. For our locker gripe was the least of our grievances. Working at the navy yard is like working in a completely open shop, since women are not members of the main union at the plant—the International Association of Machinists, AFL. We therefore had no shop steward, no grievance committee, no representation on union bodies and, least of all, no benefits of equal pay, promotion policies or other standards that a union contract would ensure.

Take our wages, for example. Though research for my book[1] had shown stories of high pay for women workers to be an utter myth, I had no idea, until I became a war worker myself, how *low* wages actually were. When my skimpy little paycheck of $23 a week came to me, I wondered how on earth I could ever live on that in wartime Washington if I were forced to pay my own room, board, transportation, doctors' bills and other necessities out of it. Then I would look around the shop and wonder how the married women and mothers—the majority there—could support their children and parents as well as themselves on these wages.

Navy-yard women start at $4.65 a day, which, with time and one-half for the sixth day, is $29.64 a week. Deduct the 20-percent withholding tax, and you find that we luxuriate on $23 a week. The highest-paid woman on production in our shop receives $6.95 a day, a peak she has attained after two years at the yard. Men get as high as $22 a day. The same low wages for beginning women workers prevail at most of the other eight navy yards in the country. Welders, however, and others who get preëmployment training are better paid. Welders at one yard receive $1.14 an hour. The wages of mechanics-learners, which is the classification we came under at the Washington yard and in which many women start at other yards, begin at 57 or 58 cents an hour.

[1] Out of the Kitchen—Into the War (New York: Stephen Daye, Inc.).

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Not only do the women start at a low wage—they stay at it. At the Washington yard and at the other navy yards in the East and West, there are no automatic raises. Miriam, who had been in the yard for eighteen months, said to me:

"At this place, it ain't what you know—it's who you know."

Raises were accorded on some indeterminate basis. Promotions to supervisory jobs seem to be unknown not only at Washington but elsewhere in navy yards. I could discover no women foremen, no women job instructors, or "snappers"—the lowest rank in the supervisory hierarchy. Up to last fall, I had heard of only three women "snappers" working at all navy yards. Others may have been promoted since then, but the going is slow.

Equal pay and promotions for women are one of the government standards of employment supported in writing by the Navy Department and seven other federal agencies. The navy yards themselves seem to be unaware of the fact; nor do they observe other standards adhered to on paper by the Department.

A few minutes before my first lunch on the day shift, I saw a woman, crouching almost double, come over to a bucket of dirty water used for cooling tools. She glanced furtively through the glass partitions separating our room from the rest of the shop and then stooped quickly and washed her hands in the filthy water.

"We aren't allowed to go out to the ladies' room and wash our hands before lunch—so this is the only water in the room and at least I can get some of the grease off my hands before I eat. If one of the bosses catches you washing you get docked and suspended," she explained, while keeping an eye out for the bosses.

Following most of the women workers, I quickly adapted myself to eating sandwiches held between grimy hands. I also had to learn to gulp down lunch in 15 minutes. The yard gave us 20 minutes for lunch, but at least five minutes were gone by the time you had raced and waited at the understaffed canteen for cold, watery chocolate milk or cola drinks (no coffee except on the midnight shift). The government standard of 30-minute lunch periods, hot lunches and a decent place to eat them is ignored by the Washington yard, which is nearer being the rule than the exception. Four out of seven yards in the nation give workers lunch periods of less than 30 minutes—15 in one yard, 20 in two and 25 in a fourth. In the other three yards, the lunch period, which is on the workers' own time, is 30, 40 and 45 minutes, respectively. Some of these other yards have hot lunches served from mobile or stationary canteens. We had to choose between cold sandwiches bought from the yard and cold sandwiches which we brought with us.

Another standard neglected by yard officials was the 15-minute rest period, morning and afternoon, advocated for women workers. I don't think many of us at the Washington yard missed these breathing spells, however. The fact was that although the work in our room was physically hard and required standing almost eight hours at a stretch in some cases (such as mine), there was such a slowdown, stemming from the top, that no one hurried. When I first caught on to my particular job, I began working at my normal speed, which is fast. The woman next to me said to me in a blasé tone:

"Don't break your neck working so fast—no one else does and the bosses won't like you any better for it."

Later a boss actually warned me:

"Take it easy; there's no rush. If you finish that there won't be anything else for you to do for a while."

On day shift we were kept fairly busy. The swing shift, from four to midnight, was the slowest. Workers stood around obviously idle for want of work, and would look alert only when a naval officer came by. The workers accepted the slowdown along with the bosses. When I asked one man the cause of it, he replied:

"Oh, it's red tape. The stuff we need in this shop is laying around in another shop and the orders to send it over here are tied up somewhere else."

I do not know whether workers at the other navy yards need rest periods more than those at Washington. Only two out of seven yards reporting have said that their women get formal rest periods, and in one of these, rests were given in the machine shop alone. In the other, women in the sail loft were given a rest period of 10 minutes every two hours. Rest periods for women, just like convenient lunch facilities for all workers, seem to be considered luxuries by yard officials.

At the Washington yard the lack of formal rest periods could not be attributed to the rush of work. Nor could one attribute it to a shortage of workers or overvaluation of the workers' time. I had mistakenly thought before going to work at the yard that minutes were precious in production. Once on the job, personnel officers and posters proclaimed the need for punctuality and perfect attendance. I was naturally surprised to learn after one day's work that the main method of disciplining these "precious" workers was to lay them off for as much as a week at a time.

Bertha, who took two or three days without permission to be with her sailor husband who was shipping out for a long time, was laid off for an entire week as a penalty. If you were one minute late in the morning, you were made to stand idle for one hour and be docked accordingly. If you forgot to tag in upon arrival at work or at lunch time, after three offenses you were laid off for a day.

There were other penalties besides being laid off, I learned when I was on the midnight shift. I saw Miriam, who had held the day shift for months, standing at a machine one night and asked her why she had changed from day work.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"You can bet your life I didn't change because I wanted to. The boss told me today at the end of my shift that I had to come in tonight."

Miriam had just married a soldier. She had accumulated one week's annual leave so she could take her honeymoon when her husband got his furlough. Before her vacation began, however, she took a day's sick leave. When she put in a slip for her vacation, the personnel officer, who had previously promised her the week off, told her:

"You don't get that week's leave now. Taking that day off when you were sick means that you can't take the week."

Miriam decided she would go ahead and take her honeymoon as planned. The result was that her first day back on the job she was forced to work 16 hours, 8 on the day shift and 8 on midnight. She was being punished by assignment to midnight for two weeks.

"Why do you stand for it?" I asked.

"I need the money, that's why," she replied simply.

That was the attitude of most of the women whom I met at the yard. They would stand for practically anything—five months without sleeping in a bed, a solid year on the graveyard shift so as to be home with the kids during the day, the double job, indigestible lunches, long hours and no promise of a future after the war—all for miserably low wages. The longer I worked side by side with them, the more I admired their endurance—but the more I seethed to see them organized in a union that would help solve their problems. And the more I saw the necessity for really planned production, planned community service, labor-utilization inspectors, labor-management committees that function and are recognized, and a program to educate the workers about the issues of the war abroad and at home. I admired the patience of the women who stuck by their jobs, day after day, though it was obvious that their usefulness to the war effort was cut in half by the very working conditions which they endured.

SUSAN B. ANTHONY II

Hell-Bent for Chaos

II. *X-Day, V-Day, and After*

As was pointed out in the first of these articles, Donald Nelson recently outlined an important new policy to be followed in cutting down war production and resuming civilian goods. The government intends to let manufacturers start producing for the civilian market, if their plants are located in areas where the shortage of manpower is not critical, even though other manufacturers in places where the shortage of workers is more serious, are still held back. His general statement of policy is unchallengeable, yet one doubts that the problem is so simple as Mr. Nelson seems to think, or that the secondary effects of such a policy will be salutary. It is likely to increase the resistance of manufacturers in war centers to the extension or expansion of their war contracts and to lead them to underestimate their labor requirements in an effort to avoid the classification of their communities as critical areas. It does not strike at the basic psychological difficulty, and in an economy still partly competitive its effects are inequitable. England long ago concentrated important segments of her civilian production in a few plants and eliminated brands and trademarks for the duration. Such a step should be taken here. It would enormously simplify the reconversion process and provide a more equitable basis for the resumption of civilian production. It would, moreover, go far to assure the continuance of our war-production effort on the level necessary to final victory.

During the transition period, it would also be highly advantageous if all "Victory" models for which short materials are released were produced according to standard specifications and purchased under contract by the government, just as we now do with war materials. Goods acquired in this manner could be distributed by the Procurement Division of the Treasury through normal trade channels, but at fixed prices. Such a procedure would facilitate the maximum utilization of our resources for the satisfaction of our most urgent consumer needs and could be used to reinforce the government's price-control program. It would also give us the same controls over demobilization that we exercised in the mobilization cycle.

From the standpoint of the worker, the transition phase also presents serious psychological problems. He still remembers the Great Depression—remembers it with his belly—and he has no such rosy hopes for the future as those expressed by Mr. Baruch or the publicists of the Committee for Economic Development. Every opinion poll has shown that, typically, he expects the wartime prosperity to fade and the old scramble for scarce jobs to begin again. As a result, he feels personally insecure, and this is particularly true if he is employed in one of the huge new war babies or in an industry whose postwar future is uncertain. He is, therefore, inclined to jump at the first sign of a contraction in war production while there are still jobs available in civilian activities. He no more wants to be left holding an empty bag than does the employer, and he knows that his bag is likely to be far emptier. It is therefore conceivable that on X-day we shall be con-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fronted with a mass movement of workers out of war industries and war centers, which can easily assume such proportions as to jeopardize the conduct of the war against Japan. It is this possibility, among others, which many advocates of national-service legislation have in mind.

The Way to Guarantee Full Employment.—But there are positive as well as negative approaches to this problem. The most important single step that could be taken would be agreement now on a postwar economic policy which would guarantee a high level of employment. The means appropriate to this end are both known and tested and a flexible program should be developed now which can later be adapted to any situation. Such a program would certainly include a "shelf" of public works, such as the Messrs. Baruch and Hancock have suggested, but it is likely that the shelf will have to be both longer and more adequately stocked than any available in government circles today. Dr. J. Raymond Walsh recently expressed the views of the CIO on this point before the Public Buildings and Grounds Committee of the House. In his judgment, we shall need during the reconversion period expenditures of about $15,000,000,000 a year on public works, and he made a strong plea for a broadened conception of what they might include. The latter suggestion is an important one. We need to get away from thinking of public works in terms of heavy construction projects, all of which absorb the same types of labor, and to think of them solely in terms of the compensatory provision of necessary goods and services.

The most direct approach to full employment under private ownership, however, is by way of the guaranteed market. Governmental purchases, under contract, of the products of our mills, factories and farms are what transformed our stalled prewar economy into an expanding one. Used as a compensatory and stabilizing device, such purchases provide a flexible means for maintaining a given level of employment and for expanding those types of production which possess the greatest utility for the largest number of persons. Properly employed in peacetime, compensatory governmental purchasing merely serves to underpin a market by guaranteeing employment, and with it, effective consumer demand. The distribution of the product can, therefore, be handled in most instances through normal private channels unless, as a matter of public policy, it is desired to subsidize certain groups of consumers. At the present time, of course, the government is merely giving away the bulk of its purchases to that sector of the population which is the armed services.

So far as effects upon employment are concerned, it makes little difference what distributive policy is followed. The important point is that we now know how to produce and to maintain full employment. Having learned that lesson, it is not likely that we shall forget it for long. It would, therefore, be sound public policy for the President and Congress to announce now that we do not propose to forget it and that the maintenance of employment is a primary responsibility of democratic government. Such an announcement would go far to eliminate the worker's deep-rooted feeling of insecurity that now makes it difficult to manage the labor force on a voluntary basis.

The Size of the Task.—The magnitude of the employment problem after X-day is staggering. In 1940, we produced more goods and services than ever before in our history. Yet only 46,000,000 persons were gainfully employed and almost 9,000,000 more were unsuccessfully seeking work. Today, when the volume of our physical output is more than 50 percent higher (after full allowance for upward changes in the price level), about 60,000,000 persons are employed, including more than 10,000,000 in the armed services, and they are working, on the average, 20 percent longer hours than in 1940.

The problems these figures suggest are of two sorts: the X-day headache of demobilizing the civilian and military personnel no longer required in the war effort against Japan and of providing for their return to normal civilian activities; and the V-day, long-term problem of maintaining production levels at a point sufficiently high to absorb our constantly expanding labor force. From the standpoint of national policy, the two are, of course, intertwined.

The X-day employment crisis will be more manageable, because it will be less severe. It is difficult to be precise about the matter because we do not know the detailed military plans for dealing with Japan. But it is safe to assume that a substantial portion of the shock of war-production curtailment after the defeat of the Nazis can be absorbed by a general reduction in the abnormally long wartime working hours.

Steps to Cushion the Shock of Reconversion.—Despite the existence of this cushion, however, we face in the reconversion period serious job dislocation and temporary unemployment which may affect as many as three or four million workers. These will not be uniformly distributed on either an industry or a geographical basis, but will be highly concentrated in certain parts of the country and in particular industries. No one imagines that the million and a half workers now in the nation's shipyards will continue indefinitely to build ships, for by the end of this year we shall have a merchant marine five times as large as it was before the war. Nor will the aircraft industry operate after X-day at anywhere near its present level. In these and a dozen other industries workers will be displaced, and it is unlikely that they can be immediately absorbed elsewhere, for civilian production will not take up the slack as rapidly as war production is curtailed.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

An employment gap of some dimensions cannot, therefore, be avoided. All we can hope to do is to limit the duration of the unemployment and mitigate its consequences. This may be accomplished in three ways: by attempting first to expand those industries which can get going most rapidly; by resuming production of prewar models, rather than waiting for new engineering and new tooling; and by making adequate financial provision for the unemployed. In the latter respect, the suggestion of Mr. Clinton Golden, vice-chairman of the War Manpower Commission, for the payment of dismissal wages to laid-off workers has great merit. The costs of such payments could be absorbed as legitimate charges against government contracting agencies and the payments themselves would help to carry the worker over the transition period or to pay his transportation costs to some area where work is available. In total war, the production worker is no less a soldier than the man in uniform and the arguments for dismissal wages in the one instance hold in considerable degree in the other.

More important than this, however, is early adoption of the Murray-Wagner-Dingell bill or similar legislation. Existing state systems of unemployment compensation are totally inadequate to cope with the reconversion and postwar unemployment problem. Unless the social-security system is strengthened on a national basis, thousands of workers will exhaust whatever savings they may have accumulated during the war and will be plunged deeply into debt before civilian production even gets under way—a poor setting in which to launch the much publicized postwar boom.

The Problem of Demobilization. – The demobilization of military personnel is a special problem in which questions of military strategy and national security naturally take precedence. But, so far as possible within these limitations, plans for military demobilization must be geared into the whole reconversion process. Armed services as large as those we now possess cannot be demobilized in a haphazard manner without producing economic chaos. If we should now follow the pattern of the last war—as there is danger that we shall do—and consider that the requirements of the armed services alone govern the timing and order in which soldiers are to be released, the results will clearly be disastrous. Nor will they be much less so if we accept the recent suggestion that fathers be demobilized first, without regard to their functions in the economy.

What is clearly required is a demobilization plan based on both the continuing requirements of the armed services and the needs of the domestic economy. In respect to the latter, the Imperial German Government drew up a plan in 1917 which is suggestive. All members of the armed forces were classified into eight groups on the basis of their functional positions in the economy and it was proposed to release them in the following order: (1) leading persons in commerce and industry, whose normal activities could serve to expand employment opportunities; (2) all heads of commercial and other concerns; (3) all independent manufacturers and farmers, regardless of their size and importance; (4) civil servants, railway employees and teachers; (5) sailors and fishermen; (6) skilled workers; (7) unskilled workers; and (8) students and other non-productive persons.

This approach is a sound one, although in our own economy we would need to employ somewhat different classifications and to alter the order of release. Skilled workers required in re-engineering activities would need to be much higher on the list and students might be placed among the first groups to be demobilized, since they would not add to an overextended labor force and since wartime attrition in highly trained personnel has serious implications for the future, unless rapidly made up. What is important, however, is that the requirements of reconversion be taken into account in any demobilization plans drawn up by the armed services.

In the final analysis, of course, the success of demobilization depends upon our ability to expand employment. The guarantee of reinstatement in a job, contained in the Selective Service Act, will be an empty gesture if the job is not there. And many jobs will not be there if we continue to allow the CED to usurp the public function of national economic planning or if, with Mr. Baruch, we refuse to confront the problem at all.

For there is a problem. It has been authoritatively estimated by a Department of Commerce expert that if we produce in 1946 at the level of 1940—and what basis is there yet to expect we shall do any better?—we shall have 19,000,000 unemployed. That conclusion is reached after making a minimum allowance for the large number of women now employed for the first time in war industry, many of whom will undoubtedly wish to continue in employment. It is based on the normal yearly increase in the size of the labor force, as a result of population changes, and on the normal yearly improvement in worker productivity. It means that in order to keep unemployment down to a couple of millions, our gross national product in 1946 will have to be in excess of $146,000,000,000 when measured in terms of 1940 prices, as compared to an output of $97,000,000,000 in that last "normal" year.

We can do it, but it is probable that we need other tools for this purpose than the "traditional American spirit of private initiative and resourcefulness," and the postwar adjustment policies of Mr. Baruch. At present, we seem hell-bent for chaos with the business planners.

J. DONALD KINGSLEY

This is the second of two articles. The first appeared in our issue of April 24. – THE EDITORS

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Hill of Alabama

SENATOR LISTER HILL of Alabama faces a bitter fight in the primary election early in May. His opponent is James Simpson, a Birmingham corporation lawyer, and the struggle is the sharpest, and one of the ugliest, seen in that state in many years. Hill is being attacked furiously for the very things which cause progressives all over the country to admire him —for his reasonable humanitarianism and for his unfaltering support of New Deal principles. The character of the campaign that is being waged against him (for which we do not charge that Mr. Simpson is responsible) is well illustrated by The Greensboro Watchman, a publication issued at Greensboro, Alabama, which breathes race hatred and ultra-toryism in every column, and is opposing Hill furiously. A few headlines from a recent issue will indicate its character: "Federal Government Urged to Force Racial Equality Down South's Throat"; "Race Riot News Not Bad Reading, Says First Lady"; "Eleanor Advised to Keep Nose Out of Dixie Problems"; "South Carolina House Raps Meddlers." This poisonous material is being spread broadcast and is undoubtedly having an effect upon the more irrational Alabamians, already excited by the recent Supreme Court decision in the Texas "White Primary" case.

Who is Senator Hill, against whom this campaign is leveled? In his long career he has only twice before been up against any serious opposition. The first time was in 1923, when at the age of 28 he was elected to the House of Representatives from the Second Alabama District. The second was in 1938, when he was elevated to the Senate to fill the unexpired term of Hugo L. Black. Hill never had an opponent in his fifteen years in the House. His success has been due chiefly to two things: his untiring efforts in behalf of any and all constituents and his attention to patronage for his district. Maxwell Field at Montgomery is the best example of the latter. Today it is one of the principal training centers of the Army Air Forces. It is primarily Hill's achievement.

Hill's record in the House was undistinguished except for his membership in and finally chairmanship of the Military Affairs Committee. It was while a member of that committee that he rendered his first notable service, in collaboration with former Senator George W. Norris, in behalf of the Tennessee Valley Authority. Hill may justly claim a large measure of credit for the success of the agency. Today, as a member of the Senate Military Affairs Committee, he is one of its most thoughtful and accomplished supporters.

On three special occasions Hill has held the national spotlight. He nominated President Roosevelt for a third term at the 1940 Democratic National Convention in Chicago. He was second man on the Ball-Hill-Burton-Hatch resolution calling upon the Senate to affirm its intention to coöperate with other nations in the world after the war. And for nearly two months last summer he was acting majority leader of the Senate in the absence of Alben Barkley.

As chairman of the House Military Affairs Committee, Hill always has been close to the War Department. It is not surprising that Hill saw the war clouds long before many of his colleagues did. He was early in realizing the role this country would have to play. He knew the problems that confronted the army and he did everything in his power to help alleviate them. A year ago some of his friends in the department began a campaign to have him appointed Secretary of War. He was not a candidate, and he was glad when the campaign died down. He wants to stay in the Senate.

Senator Hill knows that two great political hurdles confront him and all other New Dealers in the South. The first and foremost, as indicated above, is the question of white supremacy. The New Deal has been repeatedly attacked in the South for its policy of justice toward the Negro. Governor Dixon waved the bloody shirt all last year and tried to link Hill with the New Deal's racial policies. Hill could have replied with a demagogic anti-Negro speech and won the doubting Thomases. He was statesman enough not to do that. He did, however, make it a point on all occasions to denounce the anti-poll-tax bills, but he stuck to constitutional arguments against them.

Hill's second big worry is the farmer. Anti-New Dealers in Alabama work hand in glove with the Alabama Farm Bureau Federation. The Associated Industries of Alabama, for example, has been sympathetic toward all the inflationary measures designed to give the farmer higher prices. This Alabama branch of the National Association of Manufacturers is attempting to form an alliance between business and agriculture. Hill has been on guard. He has never voted against a single bill that would give the farmers more money and he has infuriated the Federation by his stanch defense of the Farm Security Administration.

Lister Hill is not a free agent. But it is the people of Alabama who control him, not the vested interests. Hill would like to arrive at all decisions independently and vote only his convictions. He has convictions and he has the sense to support them intelligently. He is a student of books and of people and, despite the exceptionally long hours which he spends in his office satisfying petty requests of constituents, he finds time in the evening to indulge his taste for history and modern literature. The man works like a Trojan—far too hard for his own good and at a pace that would kill most men—but his vigor remains unimpaired.

If Hill survives physically and politically, and if he grows as much in the next six years as he has in the last four, he will write his name among the list of Southern progressives who have faithfully served the cause of American democracy

POTOMACUS

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Washington Notes

Postwar International Problems

A POSTWAR INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION is beginning to take shape. The fact perhaps will bear repeating that it is being developed from the specific to the general, from the ground up, instead of from the top down as it was in 1918 and 1919. The last few days have seen progress on several fronts. The Treasury Department announced plans for an International Monetary Fund. The State Department and the Civil Aeronautics Board have continued their exploratory conferences with other governments in the field of international aviation. British oil leaders have been here for discussions.

The labor division of this developing organization is the only one that is a heritage of Geneva. The International Labor Office was one of the most successful products of the early League days. In its convention at Philadelphia it has asserted its right to life in the world of the future.

The divisions of this new set-up have definite territory staked out for their operations. No one of them is challenged to solve all the world's problems. The International Monetary Fund, which promises to be one of the chief economic bulwarks in the transition period, has a relatively limited field in which to operate. The permanent organization on Food and Agriculture, which soon is to come into being, will have another limited area of operations. UNRRA has another field. The World Bank for Reconstruction and Development will, when created, have its problems clearly outlined for it.

I do not believe that the tremendous significance of these technical international organizations has been sufficiently emphasized. We hear much talk about what American foreign policy after the war will be. Certainly the administration has not given a clear enough picture of its objectives. It is only in these specific attempts at international organization that we learn of the objectives.

The accomplishments to date are limited, of course. The problem of wartime travel and communication has been one of the most serious handicaps. Russian officials were late for the UNRRA conference at Atlantic City. It was not their fault. They had to wait for days in Siberia for the weather to clear. They were also delayed in the negotiations on the International Monetary Fund, but concurred in the outcome. The Fund will be extremely helpful in the rehabilitation of Russia, since the Soviets will have to have foreign exchange.

When the historian looks back upon this period he may find that the military leaders have worked with greater speed than have the diplomatic officials. If the war in Europe should end this year, the officials who must handle the problems of food, relief, foreign exchange, international loans and civil aviation would be sadly unprepared.

Even though the experts may agree in the near future at the additional conferences that are being planned for, there must follow approval from Congress. UNRRA already has the blessing of the national legislature. Secretary Morgenthau reported progress after his meetings with the seven congressional committees to explain the Monetary Fund. But a political campaign is ahead. If there is to be a new administration and a new Congress, months of delay will result. The politics of the election campaign will be sufficient to cause tragic delay.

When the Big Four who have conducted this war concentrate upon the problems of peace to the same extent that they have been forced to concentrate upon the problems of war, we may expect much more rapid progress. Mr. Churchill has suggested that the Combined (British and American) Chiefs of Staff be continued after the war. That is his contribution to thinking on the security division that must be created. He and Messrs. Roosevelt, Stalin and Chiang Kai-shek are known to have discussed the problems of security at the Cairo and Teheran conferences. But few persons know what, if any, specific decisions were made. The security division in the future world organization and the dozen or more other divisions on food, money, aviation and related fields are complementary. The first cannot stand for long without the others.

Spring has come to Washington at last, and men's thoughts turn to politics. The Republicans have scored another gain. The Steering Committee unanimously endorsed Governor Warren of California as the convention keynoter. He is the favorite son of an important state. In 1916 California held the balance of power. California and Ohio tie for the fourth most important place in the Electoral College.

If Governor Warren is a successful keynoter he probably will be the vice-presidential nominee. There still is debate within the party over whether a Far Westerner or a Middle Westerner would add the greatest weight to the ticket, and Representative Everett Dirksen of Illinois is mentioned. But the betting is in favor of California.

Notes: Senator Barkley is almost certain to be the keynote speaker at the Democratic convention. His recent temporary break with the President over the tax-bill veto has made him a powerful party figure. . . . FDR still tells visitors he does not choose to run, but most of them think he will. There is no one else who might lead the party to victory. . . . General Marshall tells his friends he positively will not be a candidate under any circumstances. He tells them that if need be, he will be more positive than General Sherman. . . . The other general who has been mentioned has been killed off by his friend. When Representative Miller published the MacArthur letters, he removed the General as a possible candidate. The General's statement clinched it. . . . Foes of price control are doing their best to wreck the program, but they do not want to take the responsibility for their acts. They profess support of price control except for themselves. . . . Prime Minister Peter Fraser made a strong impression in Washington. The New Zealander is one of the most active supporters of international coöperation after the war. . . . The House debate on Lend-Lease extension showed that the isolationists are coming out from under cover. There was much talk of the "untrustworthiness" of our allies.

Washington T. R. B.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Behind the Beyond

The Searching Wind, by Lillian Hellman. Fulton Theatre, April 12, 1944.

THERE IS ABROAD, evidently, some sort of assumption that "The Searching Wind" is an important drama. Reasons might be found for that. A certain bourgeois monotony of mind and persistent seriousness of intention are to be found throughout the scenes, whether in the Hazens' Washington drawing room, 1944, or in the Grand Hotel in Rome, 1922, the Berlin restaurant, 1923, or the room in the Hotel Meurice, 1938. The dates in themselves suggest some of the play's further appeal: these scenes are directly contemporaneous with World War II—with our pressing times. And the way we get around to these various dates and places proceeds from the dramatic device employed. The three people involved in the love triangle revive their memories of three cardinal moments in this affair of theirs, and by thrashing it out bring it to its final resolution. The first of these moments is in Rome at the time the Fascists are taking over the city. The second is in Berlin at the time the first riots begin, Nazism is being born, the Jewish quarters are being raided, and so on. The third is in Paris when Daladier and Chamberlain announce their decision to go to Munich, and the American Ambassador has to send in his advisory report to the home government. These are all high moments in our times' crucial history. Miss Hellman's play and Mr. Shumlin's directing do them well enough—considerably above the average, in fact. We must cite also as above the average two items that are necessary to such scenes: the off-stage effects, such as guns and street sounds, and the impersonations (to be distinguished from creations) of the many small foreign roles.

These historical scenes in "The Searching Wind" may be credited with definite competence in the writing. They hold our attention, however, not through any historical distinction or vision, but through their topicality.

These several Hellman summaries of world news are not followed, as you might absently expect, by mustard, pancakes, cold tablets or some such radio urgency. They are always immediately followed by what in classical mythology would have been laughed off as, shall we say, the battle of the storks, but is doubtless to be regarded as the modern problem play. It is by far more windy than searching. The major portion of these scenes is concerned with the two women, the first the rich wife of the attaché-ambassador-ex-ambassador Hazen, and the other a school teacher, whom he really loves but by one of those flukes foreseen by Euripides, promulgated by Ibsen and made flatulent by drama clubs, has had only a complex affair with.

These scenes between the two Hellman ladies, both of whom KNOW, are in the writing of them appallingly repetitive, banal, unintense, unimpassioned and underbred. The minute the two meet they begin to wash their soiled linen under each other's noses. It is not really soiled, but merely pseudo-analytical-psychological, head-in-the-box-office-feet-in-the-clouds, feministic, novelistic rubbish. Or just plain bosh. Meanwhile there are eventually the Hazen son, his grandfather, the family servant and Mr. Hazen, all of them with something to say.

This love—to use the word loosely indeed—this love story is unconvincing and without images or life, but has perhaps—surely it must assume—the excuse of countering and underscoring the world affairs presented. Just as these three people have refused to face the realities of their situation, have evaded the final issue, knowing all the while the disastrous implications, the slow wreckage of themselves, the ruin and torture of young life as it arises and as it finally surrounds them, so have we of the modern world refused to face the things to be faced, so have we lost the splendid passion and great prophetic seed of the present passing into the future. We have messed it all up, in ourselves and in the world of men around us, even perhaps of those whom Vice President Wallace has not yet heard of. I put in that last clause merely to balk any impression I might give that the historical-personal import of "The Searching Wind" is to be taken seriously as a parable of our time. Think what you like of our time, but be sure this is a very poor transmuting of it into dramatic art.

Miss Cornelia Otis Skinner essays the intangibly monotonous, graceless role of the wife—wife of the ambassador, Mr. Dennis King, whose approach is at least believably ambassadorial, which is something. Miss Skinner as an international figure, at luncheons and otherwise, is completely unconvincing. For a few pressing moments in the last act she is somewhat more effective. We may as well come down to brass tacks and say that Miss Skinner is one of those performers who need not so much a play they can act as a play that can act them. Miss Barbara O'Neill, with the lovely personal quality she brings to the stage, does no particular harm to the other female role in the story. It is not her fault that a lot of her scenes sound like Stephen Leacock. Only a very powerful and intense style in both method and acting could manage the absurdities in tragic motif and in taste that she and Miss Skinner are faced with. You simply cannot—however tasteless and serious your audience—come in from a Berlin riot in which you say an old Jewish woman was brutally murdered, and go at once into a female-catfight as to why are you here? No, I shall go away. Et cetera. (What is a mere world war so long as these feminine egotisms have their say?)

The wretched and fatal exit that the director has provided for Miss O'Neill's part extends into that of Mr. Dudley Digges, who otherwise is his own kind of perfection in the role of the rich, retired newspaper-owner father of Miss Skinner (also rich in her own right). Mr. Digges, partly because of his skill and partly because of the security of the role, provides the outstanding performance of the evening, though the flare-up afforded Mr. Montgomery Clift by the dramatist's last scene very definitely disputes his claim. In this scene the young son, about to have his leg amputated, turns on his parents with their softness, indecision and international slush, and in a very effective speech expresses his disgust, his shame and his love for them. Mr. Clift is one of our most educated and conscientious young actors. His one threatening defect comes very likely from working in company with Mr. Alfred Lunt. Mr. Lunt's early years in a foreign country not seldom combine with nerve strain to produce sounds that are scarifying, to say the least. Mr. Clift needs none of that, and without it he should go far.

STARK YOUNG

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Great Brain Robbery

"THE LADY AND THE MONSTER" is a horror movie made by George Sherman for Republic Pictures which gets into gear at about the three-quarter mark and comes home, if not a winner, a film that is imaginative and effective. The story has essentially to do with a crippled scientist (Erich von Stroheim) who discovers a way to keep a brain alive after the rest of its owner has died. The brain is kept alive in a solution that contains adrenalin and it records its aliveness through an invention of the scientist's assistant (Richard Arlen) called the encephalograph. The encephalograph looks and acts like the mechanical arrangements for fountain-pen displays that show how long and nice a line the pen can make. When they have succeeded in keeping the brain alive and making wiggly pen lines, their problem is to find out what the brain is thinking or wanting to do with itself. After what I thought was a frivolous suggestion of Arlen's—that they get to the brain with Morse Code—they hit on a plan of keying the brain up with more adrenalin and having Arlen empty himself of all thought and action so that the brain can use him as a telepathic agent.

At this point the picture and Arlen pick up wonderfully. Arlen is changed by the brain into the person the brain belonged to and goes to Los Angeles to finish up some of that person's unfinished business. The change in Arlen from his usual tendency to be a piece of sculpture to his being an aggressive, dominating person is managed with real film imagination and talent. The people and environments he gets involved with under the brain's direction are far less corny and more believable than those around the laboratory, and the main problem that turns up—about a misdirected murder trial—contains real interest and even suspense.

All of "The Lady and the Monster's" troubles have to do with what are considered horror-movie fixtures. The real interest of the film is in what will come of the murder trial Arlen gets involved in and, for some reason, your concern over what the movie will decide is the social end of the brain discovery. But this is all evaded by bringing in two conventions. The scientist has to be a monster and there has to be a lady he is after; she finally influences Arlen to destroy the scientist and his work because Arlen is not himself any more, and she is afraid the scientist is in love with her, and that the whole business is illegal because the brain was stolen from a dead body, which is against the law. There are also the other conventions of horror movies: the wind ripping up outside a spookhouse, which looks like a Mongolian idiot produced by the marriage of a French castle and a Spanish bungalow in Los Angeles; the evil-eyed, crippled scientist puttering with glass retorts; a burlesque-proportioned blonde sliding in at every moment in a new silk gown and fearfully handing him a hemostat; in the background a mean-looking household drudge stands unnamed and untalked to; and then the scientist ominously calls for the "Jiggly-saw" to rip open someone's skull.

But in spite of all this whirling around of cliché, it is a good example of the low-budget picture that is sometimes apt to take an unpromising script and a set of conventions and by really commendable work on the actual filming give it dignity and intelligence.

On the other hand, there is no reason to go to see another quickie made by the Pine and Thomas firm for Paramount, called "I Live on Danger." But if you catch it on a double bill you will find it is not bad at all, and for many of the same reasons. The B's have generally a more convincing actuality than the expensive films, probably for the fact that they have less money to spend building sets and lighting them so they shine and sparkle, and designing costumes that almost walk by themselves. With less money and time to inject spurious entertainment angles into his film, the B director is more likely to spend his time making what he has real rather than classy. There is not nearly so much need for him to make a box-office miracle of his film, so there is less selling of popular attitudes and less jazzing up of ordinary circumstances. B films are also an inevitable refuge for players who are no longer pretty or handsome enough to meet expensive film standards, or for those who are just hard up for work, and many of them are seasoned players. For instance, the film mentioned above, which is concerned with a radio reporter's adventures, has Chester Morris, for my money a very capable and ingratiating actor.

MANNY FARBER

The Bandwagon

A commission of inquiry on the freedom of the press established under a financial grant from Time, Inc., to conduct a two-year investigation to determine how the Bill of Rights is working out in the United States, held its first sessions last week in New York City. The free press was barred from the two-day sessions which were conducted in "strictest privacy" by President Robert M. Hutchins of the University of Chicago, commission chairman.—*From The Guild Reporter.*

I am writing to ask your help on a most peculiar subject, because you are the only woman I know who is in close contact with United States troops. I have been instructed by my superiors to find out exactly what the Americans mean by "necking" and whether the game is fully understood by English girls. . . .—*A high-ranking officer of the ATS writing to the American Red Cross, as quoted in The New York Times.*

SUSPECT INSISTS HE FIGHTS FASCISM
Accused Mayor of Naples Says He
Joined Party 18 Years Ago
Only Under Duress
—*Head and subhead in The New York Times.*

Secret Weapon?

It is now recognized widely that the President's chief political strength lies in etaoin shrdlu.—*From The Chicago Tribune.*

On the Home Front

The OPA aides reported in addition that the Café Chambord, specializing in French provincial cuisine, had raised to $12 the regular dinner and to $15 the special dinner featuring pheasant under the description of "Le Coq en Belle Vue Edward VII, for two," priced respectively at $10 and $12 last April.—*From The New York Times.*

Our readers are invited to contribute to this column; $1 will be paid for each item used. Address Bandwagon, care of The New Republic. Please enclose the original clipping.—THE EDITORS

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Correspondence

Academic Freedom and Oleomargarine

SIR: May I express to you our extreme regret that Mr. J. M. O'Neill in your February 14 issue, beginning on page 206, should have made statements with reference to academic freedom at the Iowa State College which are not at all in accordance with the facts. I am astounded that a professor who is so profoundly interested in academic freedom, as we all should be, did not investigate the facts more carefully. He quotes a statement from the December Reader's Digest which is nothing more than a newspaper blurb with certain facts which have been unwisely distorted. May I call your attention specifically to some points in the discussion by Professor O'Neill which, in my opinion, should lead to a correction.

On page 206 Professor O'Neill states, "I have seen no statement in President Friley's words. But if the press reports are approximately true, he has given up without a fight the fortress for truth and the public interest which he commanded, and he has surrendered to a self-seeking pressure group which is trying to make a profit out of ignorance."

May I say with a good deal of emphasis that it is most unfortunate that Professor O'Neill did not look into the matter somewhat more carefully. The following statements are pertinent.

President Friley, both in writing and in a public official statement, committed himself as follows:

1. The right of a member of the staff of Iowa State College to publish the results of his work was not in question by the institution and from his point of view was not even debatable. [I know of no stronger expression than this in the history of the development of academic freedom.]

2. When the professor seeks publication in a college publication issued under the federal mandate to the Agricultural Experiment Station for distributing educational material, that is, in an officially sponsored publication, the manuscript should be passed in review by a committee of competent staff members to make sure that the material presented is, as far as can be determined, factually correct and in good educational form. In other words, it is expected that the determination of acceptability of a manuscript for publication in an official college series should be on the same basis as the determination of acceptability by any standard scientific or technical journal.

Dr. Friley has at no time rescinded this statement. It still stands as the official pronouncement by the president of the institution.

President Friley refused to entertain recommendations of pressure groups that there be dismissals in our Department of Economics. Mr. Brownlee is a member of the staff and has been working during the past year on a revision of the manuscript which has now been completed, which has been reviewed by a faculty committee and is in process of publication. If, as seems not improbable, Mr. Brownlee will be called into military service, he will be given leave with the understanding that, in his case as in all similar cases, his place will be held for him until his return from the service. This last is not only an institutional obligation, but a state requirement.

The impression given by Professor O'Neill is that the primary purpose of the pamphlet written by Mr. Brownlee was to give facts with reference to margarine. The discussion of this problem was incidental merely to the discussion of the much broader problem of putting dairying on a war footing.

If there were any point to it, a complete discussion of the controversy here at Iowa State College, which frankly revolved largely around sponsorship of publications and not around problems of academic freedom, might be submitted. To the best of my knowledge and belief, there is no problem of academic freedom involved. At the present moment, through staff committee studies on the meaning of sponsorship with reference to academic publications, there has been developed a document which has the unanimous approval of the staff of the Agricultural Experiment Station and which I believe to be the clearest expression of policy that has been developed in this field.

I am enclosing a copy of a letter which I am sending to Professor O'Neill.

R. E. BUCHANAN, Director,
Agricultural Experiment Station,
Ames, Ia. Iowa State College

SIR: Obviously, it is impossible to reproduce in the columns of The New Republic all of the evidence concerning the violation of academic freedom at Iowa State College in 1943. If anyone is interested in the details, I suggest that they read (in addition to the Reader's Digest article which I cited) the following:

1. An article in The Des Moines Register of September 19, 1943, written by J. S. Russell, the farm editor of that paper. This deals with Dr. Schultz's resignation and his letter to President Friley under the headline, "Freedom at I.S.C. Curbed."

2. An article in The Des Moines Register of September 23, 1943, written by Dr. T. W. Schultz himself. This contains seven specific charges, including the "fact that the social science staff has decided, in view of the present restriction of academic freedom, that the wartime farm and food service should be discontinued."

3. An article in the December, 1943, Harper's by Wesley McCune, assistant editor of the Washington bureau of Newsweek, entitled "The Oleomargarine Rebellion." After discussing the difficulties produced by Mr. Brownlee's famous Pamphlet No. 5, the demands of the president of the creamery corporation for the recall of the pamphlet, and the removal from the faculty of its authors, etc., Mr. McCune reports that President Friley "met for two hours with 100 dairymen," and "arranged for a joint committee of faculty members and dairy representatives to review this bulletin paragraph by paragraph." Note the inclusion of the representatives of the protesting pressure group to study, paragraph by paragraph, a scholarly pamphlet which had been prepared by Mr. Brownlee of the staff of the college under an editorial board which included Dr. Schultz, (who has since resigned to go to the University of Chicago), Dr. Walter Wilcox (who has since resigned to go to the University of Wisconsin), Dr. A. G. Hart, who is now working for the Treasury Department in Washington, and Dr. Margaret Reid, also working for the government in Washington; all recently of the Department of Economics and Sociology of Iowa State College.

Does President Friley or Dr. Buchanan wish to be understood as contending that a pamphlet prepared under the editorial supervision of Schultz, Wilcox, Hart and Reid needs to have the *imprimatur* of dairymen, or anyone else, in order that the interests of truth and "educational good form" may be protected? The very appointment of such a committee after the controversy that had been stirred up by the dairymen is an affront to academic freedom, to scholarship, and to the whole faculty of Iowa State College.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In all that Dr. Buchanan has written to you, Mr. Editor, and to me, I find little but words of protest and hackneyed words of devotion to academic freedom, which seem wholly inconsistent with the facts of the two long articles of last September in The Des Moines Register, the article in the December Harper's and the article in Reader's Digest.

Evidently the Reader's Digest article had one inaccurate statement. It appears that Mr. Brownlee has not been on leave this year. I cannot figure out how the physical presence of Mr. Brownlee in Ames, Iowa, rather than in Timbuktu or Shangri-La, has anything at all to do with whether or not the principles of academic freedom have been violated at Iowa State College in connection with what Mr. McCune called "The Oleomargarine Rebellion." However, for whatever it is worth, let it be entered on the record that Mr. Brownlee was not on leave.

Now may I say in my turn, Mr. Editor (with whatever emphasis anyone cares to read into it), that it is most unfortunate that Mr. Buchanan did not utilize the exceptional opportunities which were available to one in his position in Iowa State College to look into this matter somewhat more carefully before writing the above letter to you. I still believe that it is impossible for anyone to read the detailed published discussions of the Iowa State case and to avoid the conclusion that it is a clear and extreme case of denial of academic freedom.

J. M. O'NEILL,
Chairman of the Committee on Academic Freedom
Brooklyn, N. Y. of the American Civil Liberties Union

Full Circle

SIR: To tickle your Toynbee-like sense of history's repetition-compulsions, I submit the following comment by Professor Breasted, made in 1935, on a prior Teutonic occupation of Rome [in "Ancient Times: A History of the Early World"], which seems as timely as a contemporary block-buster:

> The venerable city of Rome, with its long centuries as mistress of the world behind it, had gained a position of unique respect and veneration even among the barbarians. The Goths and the Vandals had stoood in awe and reverence under the shadow of its magnificent public buildings. They had left them uninjured, and in all its monumental splendor Rome was still the greatest city of the world, rivaled only by Constantinople and Alexandria, the two other imperial cities. It was natural that the bishop of Rome should occupy a position of unusual power and respect. When the West Goths were threatening the city, and also in other important crises caused by the incoming of the barbarians, the bishop of Rome had more than once shown an ability which made him the leading statesman of Italy, if not of the West. There is no doubt that his influence had much to do with the respect which the West Goths and the Vandals had shown the city in sparing its buildings.

New York City S. T. V.

Let the 18-Year-Olds Vote

SIRS: Twelve months have passed through the eternal sieve of time since the Commonwealth of Georgia took a forward venture in lowering her voting age to 18. In the other 47 states there has been little if any concerted action to this effect.

Needless to say, most young adults of 18 to 21 are high-school graduates, and many have completed two or more years of college. As facts prove, the educational record of this group exceeds by far that of our own (over 21) age group.

In addition, most of these young people are, conceivably enough, economically self-sufficient. As we know, many are married or in business for themselves. The vast majority pay taxes, which raises another issue, "no taxation without representation." Yes, our youth are as much an integral part of society as we older folk. Therefore should they not be allowed to share in the government of that society?

Textbooks claim that one of the fundamentals of American democracy is the right of all adult citizens to vote. If that be the case, how about the six million who cannot do so? Let us not forget that many of our sons, nephews and younger brothers are fighting and dying for democracy, which is little more than a word to them. Surely, if a man is old enough to shoulder a gun, he's old enough to vote.

The Affiliated Young Democrats are conducting a nationwide campaign to extend the ballot to 18-year-olds. They need and merit support. Both major parties in the coming conventions should adopt a plank calling for this proposal. How about it?

Camp McCain, Miss. PVT. H. H.

Goodbye Now

SIR: It surprised me to see in The New Republic for April 10 Stark Young's rosy praise of "Goodbye, Mr. Chippendale." " . . . Diverting . . . often brilliant, based on a genuine culture and wide, exact knowledge . . . has an assurance that is aristocratic and consistent . . . a main premise [that is] startling and significant," says Mr. Young.

Diverting it is, if one is easily diverted, but the formula is obvious: Break open an eye-catching title, like "Shoo Shoo, Sheraton," or "Hello, Hepplewhite," or perhaps "Got Those Louis the Fourteenth Blues"; add several dashes of cute chapter titles, such as "Pardon My Beamed Ceiling" or "Swingin' on the Old Bergère" or "Don't Look Now, But Your Baroque Is Showing"; stir in a wisecracking hash of well known facts and unoriginal theories; coat with a light frosting of Frank Lloyd Wright, Louis Sullivan and the Tennessee Valley Dam; put in oven and half-bake, while chanting "architecture for democracy" to the tune of "Cash for Your Trash." . . .

Mr. Young might do well, if he cares to study Mr. Robsjohn-Gibbings further, to look at Volume X, No. 3, of The Architectural Digest. There he will find a sample of the work of this crusader for democracy's own designs; sphinxes and fat little cupids supporting tables; chairs with tortured cabriole legs, and similar DeMille effects. Probably this only indicates that Mr. R.-G. is a very recent convert to the cause of "good" design.

Mr. R.-G. finds the TVA good. Must we, then, keep our leftovers in a turbine, and entertain our friends in a switch-yard?

New York City ANN KEES

From The New Republic Mail Bag

From Lawrence Rogin, educational director of the Textile Workers' Union of America, we have received a letter which took exception to our brief review of the pamphlet "Mississippi's BAWI Plan" (April 3). Mr. Rogin states: "To us in the labor movement, BAWI was just a state-sponsored scheme for establishing sweatshops in Mississippi with government protection. . . . I am strongly in favor of increasing industrialization in that section of the country. But an industrialization which makes its appeal to sweatshop employers seeking starvation wage levels is neither healthful to the country as a whole nor to the area which attracts the industry."

The University of Denver is planning to hold an Inter-American Education Workshop from June 19 to July 21. Opportunity will be provided for the study of inter-American affairs, including the new methods of foreign-language and area study which have been found effective by our armed forces. About twenty scholarships will be available to qualified persons. More detailed information may be obtained from Dr. Wilhelmina Hill of the University of Denver.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Reading and Writing

I went to the circus and loafed around the back side till the watchman went by, and then dived in under the tent. I had my twenty-dollar gold piece and some other money, but I reckoned I better save it, because there ain't no telling how soon you are going to need it, away from home and amongst strangers that way. You can't be too careful. I ain't opposed to spending money on circuses when there ain't no other way, but there ain't no use in *wasting* it on them.

It was a real bully circus. It was the splendidest sight that ever was when they all come riding in, two and two, and gentleman and lady, side by side, the men just in their drawers and undershirts, and no shoes nor stirrups, and resting their hands on their thighs easy and comfortable—there must 'a' been twenty of them—and every lady with a lovely complexion, and perfectly beautiful, and looking like a gang of real sure-enough queens, and dressed in clothes that cost millions of dollars, and just littered with diamonds. It was a powerful fine sight; I never see anything so lovely. And then one by one they got up and stood, and went a-weaving around the ring so gentle and wavy and graceful, the men looking ever so tall and airy and straight, with their heads bobbing and skimming along, away up there under the tent-roof, and every lady's rose-leafy dress flapping soft and silky around her hips, and she looking like the most loveliest parasol.

And then faster and faster they went, all of them dancing, first one foot out in the air and then the other, the horses leaning more and more, and the ring master going round and round the center pole, cracking his whip and shouting "Hi!—hi!" and the clown cracking jokes behind him; and by and by all hands dropped the reins, and every lady put her knuckles on her hips and every gentleman folded his arms, and then how the horses did lean over and hump themselves! And so one after the other they all skipped off into the ring, and made the sweetest bow I ever see, and then scampered out, and everybody clapped their hands and went just about wild.

THIS PASSAGE, which is part of an interlude in Chapter XXII of "The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn" (immediately following the overpowering scene in which Colonel Sherburn rebuffs the lynching mob), has always struck me as a notable example of a kind of writing by no means exclusively American, but marked in modern American writing at its best. Its apparent artlessness, emphasized by Huck's grammatical lapses and broad boy's dialect, conceals a structure that, if of a somewhat simpler order, is as consciously controlled as the grandiloquent prose architecture of the eighteenth century.

It is prose that superbly fulfills its function; here of rendering the color, pageantry and above all the movement of a circus performance as it works upon a boy's imagination. The cadences of the last two paragraphs quoted above enforce the description of the several phases of the action. The preliminary easy riding is suggested by the balanced construction ("two and two, and gentleman and lady, side by side . . . drawers and undershirts . . . no shoes nor stirrups . . . their hands on their thighs easy and comfortable . . ."). When the performers stand up on their horses, the phrases expand to a rolling tripartite gait ("so gentle and wavy and graceful . . . so tall and airy and straight . . . their heads bobbing and skimming along, away up there under the tent-roof, and every lady's rose-leafy dress flapping soft and silky around her hips . . ."). Then the action accelerates to a rousing climax and drops to a close while "everybody clapped their hands and went just about wild"—in an appropriate spondaic terminal.

There are sections of this circus interlude in "Huckleberry Finn" that are out of character. "The most loveliest parasol," I suspect, is not the primitive poet in Huck, but the overreaching artist in Samuel Langhorne Clemens, and there are elements in the rest of the passage, only a part of which is quoted here, that lead directly to O. Henry and Penrod. But the clean-limbed functional quality of the prose, its exciting exploitation of language, its rightness in significant details ("every lady put her *knuckles* on her hips") are the chief, if not the only, virtues of our best writing in the last twenty-five years. They are to be found in Sherwood Anderson and Ernest Hemingway, whose debt to Twain is obvious and acknowledged, in Lardner, Fitzgerald, Dos Passos, Faulkner and Caldwell. One thinks, off-hand, of "I'm a Fool" and "I Want to Know Why," Hemingway's descriptions of the more elementary pursuits of soldiers, hunters, commercial fishermen, bullfighters and intellectuals, Fitzgerald's "The Short Trip Home," which is a Jamesian ghost story through sharper eyes and ears, Dos Passos' bindlestiffs en route or Charlie Anderson on a tear (in all the talk about the *surface* qualities of Dos Passos' writing no one has bothered to point out that almost all of the much admired fiction of the eighteenth century is from the outside in), the truncated, abortive folk-myths of "God's Little Acre."

On the other hand, it goes without saying that each of these writers has often squandered the gift, as Twain squandered it, and like him they are for the most part only satisfying *passim* or in their shorter pieces. It is a commonplace that Twain's best long books, "Huckleberry Finn" and "Life on the Mississippi," after brilliant careers limp to the finish. None of the longer books of the above-mentioned modern writers is a sustained performance comparable to the work of such otherwise dissimilar novelists as James and Dreiser, each of whom blocked out massive books and fully realized them.

I have little faith in the finality of the notion of national genius in literature, or indeed in its validity in any other field of human activity. But the virtues that I find consummately illustrated in Mark Twain's work at its best are more prominent in recent American writing than in the other national literatures with which I am familiar. Nor is there necessarily a connection between the fact that the possessors of this gift from Twain to Hemingway have been largely unable to write sustained long works of fiction. But these are phenomena that young novelists who obviously have this talent, Saul Bellow, John Hersey and Charles Jackson, for example, might carefully explore.

Cultural Notes: The International Mark Twain Society, Webster Groves, Missouri, offers a prize of $10 for the best limerick on Mark Twain. The judges will be James Thurber, Frank Sullivan and Clement Wood. The contest closes July 1, 1944.

Students of the Mark Twain high schools of Brooklyn and Yonkers, New York, placed wreaths on Twain's bust at New York University's Hall of Fame on April 20, 1944. After the ceremony there were speeches by Jesse L. Lasky and Fredric March of Hollywood, California.

GEORGE MAYBERRY

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Books in Review

The Devil a Monk Was He

IT IS HARD to imagine anyone more unsuited by temperament to write a religious novel than W. Somerset Maugham. His style is worldly, disillusioned and agnostic, in the tradition of Voltaire and Anatole France. His heroines are usually more vivid than his heroes, and they tend to fall into one of two categories. Either they are little furry animals, wholesome and appealing, like Sally Athelny in "Of Human Bondage" (when Philip Carey asked her to *marry him*, she said, "If you *like*," and then, "I want my lunch") or else they are splendid beasts of prey like the heroine of "The Letter." Their moral sense is on a level with that of doe rabbits or tigresses. You can search for a long time in Maugham's previously published works—which include twelve novels, seven volumes of stories, four travel books, two personal narratives and eighteen plays—without finding such qualities as faith or hope or ecstasy (except that he once thought of translating the Spanish mystical poet, John of the Cross) or prayerfulness or self-sacrifice. What you do find is a mood of resignation halfway between stoicism and cynicism. "O life, where is thy sting!" Philip Carey exclaims in one of his almost happy moments. Philip's character is based on that of the younger Maugham, and this is his nearest approach to a religious emotion.

It is possible that the author has changed since the fall of France, which was his second country and his spiritual home. There were a few grave notes in "Strictly Personal," the book that described his escape to England. Or again—though the suggestion may be unfair—it is possible that he looked at the sales reports of "The Keys of the Kingdom," "The Song of Bernadette" and "The Robe," which were the best-selling novels of 1941, 1942 and 1943, while he wondered whether another novel with a religious theme mightn't be the best-seller of 1944. His new book [1] is advertised as "the story of a man who found a faith," but the faith is unconvincing in itself and extraneous to the rest of the story. Essentially "The Razor's Edge" is Maugham's familiar cocktail, with a dash of holy water that doesn't change its flavor.

It has a saintly hero named Larry Darrell who tries to find God, who reads mystical authors, who works with his hands, who doesn't marry several beautiful women, but instead goes off to India, where he spends five years absorbing virtue and knowledge till at last he feels himself at one with the Absolute. But Larry wanders in and out of the story, and his saintliness is manifested chiefly in his ability to cure the migraine headaches of his wealthy friends. You feel that Maugham is a little bored with Larry; that he would rather talk about the tigerlike Isabel or the rabbitlike Suzanne Rouvier. And besides these two figures out of his earlier novels, there is also Sophie Macdonald, who is the Girl in the Green Hat and the heroine of "The Sun Also Rises," but in a further stage of degradation: this time she is not only a drunkard and a nymphomaniac (and how frank about it!) but she smokes opium and ends by having her throat cut and her naked body dumped into Toulon harbor. You can imagine the author saying in a tired way, "If the religious chapter doesn't hold them—and frankly, I don't see why it should—here's sex enough to keep them busy."

But for all its sex and saints and high society, "The Razor's Edge" is one of Maugham's weaker novels; better than "The Hour Before the Dawn," but a long step down even from "Cakes and Ale." When you consider that his first book was published in 1897 and that, during a career of almost fifty years, he has produced very little first-class work—"Of Human Bondage" and "The Summing Up" and a few admirable stories, especially those in "Ashenden"—you sometimes wonder why people go on reading and reviewing him seriously. Yet everything he writes is the expression of a keen mind with an amazing breadth of literary interests and real wisdom about people. His flimsiest books have something in them to reward the reader, even if it is only a short passage. In "Strictly Personal" it was only one sentence, about the fall of France, yet the sentence will continue to be quoted after the book has been forgotten. In "The Razor's Edge" there are three paragraphs about Racine that are more perceptive than Lytton Strachey's famous essay and that also cast a light on Maugham himself. Like Racine, he has a sense of liberty when working within conventions—any conventions; and his tigerlike heroines are the step-daughters of Racine's Phedra.

But the book is to be remembered chiefly for its portrait of an elderly American snob. Elliott Templeton is a rich bachelor, somewhat on the lavender side, who has elected to join the European aristocracy. His principal purpose in life is giving or being invited to brilliant parties; his principal occupation is gossip. He is a comic and even a repulsive figure; yet Maugham makes him likable in a curious way, not only for his loyalty to his sister's family, but also for his innocence and single-mindedness in pursuit of trivialities. The one scene in the novel that has a genuine, though rather slight, religious feeling is Elliott's death on the Riviera, with the bishop himself arriving to give Extreme Unction. Afterwards the dying man makes a few remarks on heaven. "We know from Holy Writ," he says to Maugham, "that there are class distinctions in heaven just as there are on earth. There are seraphim and cherubim, archangels and angels. I have always moved in the best society in Europe and I have no doubt that I shall move in the best society in heaven." That is hardly an elevated thought, but at least it is more convincing than handsome Larry Darrell in the role of a Hindu saint. And it becomes more convincing still when the radiant look fades from Elliott's face as he thinks of the lady who is giving a brilliant party that night and hasn't invited him. "The old bitch," he says, just before sinking back into his final coma.

MALCOLM COWLEY

[1] The Razor's Edge, by W. Somerset Maugham. New York: Doubleday, Doran and Company. 343 pages. $2.75.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Slow But Sure

The Listening Post, by Thomas B. Morgan. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 242 pages. $3.
The Vatican and the War, by Camille Cianfarra. New York: E. P. Dutton and Company. 344 pages. $3.

IN SPITE OF the many marks of respect and the many favors which nowadays are being dispensed to the Vatican by the highest authorities in the West, the political future of the Catholic Church in Europe looks dark. In Austria, in Italy, in Spain, any genuine resurrection of the body politic, however mild, can hardly be expected to lead to anything but abrogations of Concordats and curbs of varying severity imposed on clerical activities and power. The wounds inflicted by the acts, words, omissions and commissions of the Catholic hierarchy are, in those countries, much too recent. In France, the high clergy has been prudent enough to shun at least some of the favors which Pétain threatened to shower on them in the days of his Indian summer. But France is still the country where the Vichy law enforcing religious instruction in the schools had to be withdrawn in the face of unanimous resistance on the part of the teachers: the Fourth Republic will presumably not be less strict than the Third in matters of Church privileges. And it is rather difficult to imagine a Catholic revival in post-Hitler Germany. Of course, the possibility of a Concordat with Stalin is not barred. But at present, North and South America have become the only important bases from which the Vatican can operate.

Under these circumstances it is understandable that Catholics and admirers of Catholic wisdom and Catholic pageant should make some effort to familiarize the American public with the idea that the Vatican is an important spiritual and political force which should be granted an ample share not only of free play but of active support if the misty region currently called "postwar world" is to look really inviting. We have here Mr. Morgan, who declares himself a non-Catholic "looking with eager will at understanding" Catholic symbols and who seems interested in bringing home one very simple and modest point, namely, that the United States would greatly profit by establishing formal and permanent diplomatic relations with the Holy See. Mr. Morgan does not want to enter into thorny questions, such as the nature and aims of Vatican policies in modern times. He much prefers to go back and forth from the arrival of the apostle Peter in Rome to the diplomatic status of the Holy See as defined in the Treaty of Vienna; from Garibaldi to Mussolini and then back again to the tenuous series of accidents by which the United States lost the advantage of having an ambassador, or at least a minister, in the Vatican. As for more recent times, Mr. Morgan is quite content with softly smothering any possible crudeness of detail or shrill note by having recourse to the most desperate of all journalistic techniques: giving the official story and nothing but the official story. It is a kind of beating around the bush in slow motion. The conclusion comes in a whisper: "It is *the* listening post" (italics mine).

Mr. Cianfarra, being a Catholic, feels much more at ease with his subject, and as a result, he is also more readable. He gives us a great deal of monsignorial gossip, long descriptions of superbly staged Vatican ceremonies, some anecdotes of Fascist folklore (everybody will appreciate Ciano, in 1939 back from Salzburg, where the chains of the Axis had rattled rather noisily, proclaiming to Roman princes and marquises that he had gone so far in sustaining Italian prestige as to be bad-mannered with Ribbentrop's daughter). And when it comes to the policies of the Holy See, it would be unfair to say that Mr. Cianfarra avoids unpleasant issues. His approach is quite different: he starts by admitting practically all the facts on which critics of Vatican policies base their accusations, even adding some details of his own. Only he wants to convey to us the feeling that to take those facts out of the Limbo where they belong in order to draw conclusions would be extremely crude. We are reminded that, for the Holy See, Austrian Catholic fascism "represented the ideal form of government, since it had adopted Christian corporativism"; that "Italy's and Germany's aid to Generalissimo Franco . . . allied the Papacy with Nazism in Spain"; that Vatican predilection for Italian fascism did not stop in 1938, but went on in 1939 and 1940. We are told that from the point of view of the Holy See, "the first and most important result of the Axis was Mussolini's support of Hitler's anti-Bolshevist policy, and for this reason the attitude of the Vatican towards that political development was favorable," which, in a way, and especially coming from a Catholic source, is news. And news of an even more sensational quality is the revelation that Pius XI's last address, far from being the attack on totalitarianism it was supposed to be, "was to be a conciliatory one," prevented only by death; that Pius XII's foremost desire was to avoid "the personal fights that had characterized the last stage of Pius XI's pontificate," and as a result "in the period between his election and coronation Pius XII tried to achieve a compromise with Hitler on the situation of the Church in Germany."

When it comes to explaining the establishment of diplomatic relations between the Holy See and Japan on March 27, 1942, at the very peak of Japanese successes in the Pacific, Cianfarra gives the floor to a monsignore. And the monsignore explains: "You have lost the Philippines. Thousands of Anglo-American soldiers have been made prisoners. His Holiness has been deeply concerned over their welfare. . . . The Vatican Information Service now . . . has a regular diplomatic channel through which it can materially aid the plight of Christian soldiers. . . . You may see for yourself that the Vatican has now become the link between Washington and Tokyo."

All this appears to Mr. Cianfarra as the quintessence of diplomatic subtlety, such as only the Vatican can afford. On this premise he conveys to the American public the Vatican claim to a place as a sovereign power at the peace table. The claim is based on the fact that the Mussolini-Pius XI treaty of 1929 already recognized the Papacy as an independent and sovereign power. The only thing left is to make such recognition international. The clear implication is that it should be made impossible for any future Italian government to abrogate that treaty. And the final sentence of Cianfarra's book reads: "The support of religion and the promotion of its activities by the lay governments, then, will be one of the prerequisites of a permanent peace." A rather comprehensive program.

NICOLA CHIAROMONTE

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Impediments to Peace

The Constitution and World Organization, by Edward S. Corwin. Princeton: Princeton University Press. 64 pages. $1.

IS IT REALLY POSSIBLE to get a genuine internationalism accepted by the American government? Many a friend of world order, his memory of the Versailles debacle made still more gloomy by watching Senate cavortings since, has come to assume that something inherent in the American governmental structure blocks the way. Such fear and such fatalism are squarely faced in Mr. Corwin's potent sixty-four pages, which put scholarship at the service of the nation by combining it with cogency, readability and brevity. "The Constitution and World Organization" is the kind of book more scholars should write, and more university presses should publish.

Mr. Corwin's method is to examine whether American entrance into an international organization is blocked by prevailing concepts of sovereignty, by constitutional limitations, or by the "recalcitrant one-third plus one man of the Senate." Irrefutably he answers isolationist arguments tortured out of constitutional limitations. The muddled debate about sovereignty is reduced to two compelling conclusions: "When Total War is the price of Total Sovereignty, the price is too high"; the meaning most generally given to sovereignty by American statesmen has been sovereignty under international law, and that law implies the existence of institutions to support the obligations it imposes. So far as the two-thirds prerogative of the Senate is concerned, Mr. Corwin demonstrates that ample precedents exist for by-passing it by executive agreements, by the delegation to the President of enumerated powers of Congress involving foreign affairs, or even by a simple majority in both houses of Congress. So ineffective is the prerogative of the Senate likely to prove, Mr. Corwin suggests, that the Senate itself should sponsor an amendment which would submit treaties to a majority of the whole Congress. In short, nothing in the American governmental structure, neither law, concepts nor practice, necessarily stands in the way of full participation in a world order.

Here is cheerful doctrine, perhaps over-cheerful, for Mr. Corwin's incontestable proof that nothing need stand in the way at times takes on the tone of making the highly contestable implication that nothing will. There is little reason to believe that prerogative-proud Senators will amend away their prerogative, particularly since it also serves as an effective partisan tool. (The Versailles Treaty was defeated by a vote that was primarily partisan and carefully shepherded by men who sought to make a political issue out of internationalism.) Continued by-passing of the senatorial prerogative is likely to produce an increasing congressional recalcitrance, and congressmen have a special instinct for handling public opinion when the Constitution, or the congressional version thereof, is involved. But these lugubrious speculations merely emphasize the importance of the point which this book establishes beyond further cavil: The American people are entirely free to have the foreign policy they want—and can make their government want.

ERIC F. GOLDMAN

"The most complete and penetrating general survey of native American art ever published."
—*New York Times*

Medieval American Art

By Pál Kelemen

The astounding achievements of pre-Columbian America in architecture, sculpture, pottery, weaving, metalwork, and other applied arts are here fascinatingly presented in the light of art history. It is a brilliant revelation of the cultures of our Southwest, and of the Maya, Aztec, Inca, and other American people.

- "Nowhere can you find in one publication 960 such pictures of the great and significant art products of prehistoric America and nowhere so wise an analysis of them. Kelemen's wisdom is the outstanding feature of his text. His judgments are soundly considered and clearly put. His grasp is full, persuasive." —*The New Republic*
- "I am filled with admiration . . . an exciting monument to a great and diverse art." — *Frederick M. Clapp, Frick Collection*
- "An excellent work . . . the most important yet written."—*Alfonso Caso, Director, Inst. of Anthropology and History, Mexico.*
- "The importance of the book can hardly be exaggerated. The account is so astoundingly good that one is tempted to leave criticism for praise. It is lucid and inclusive . . . abundantly illustrated."—*The Nation*

For complete description send for six-page illustrated circular.

Two volumes, 960 superb photographs, $22.50

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

60 Fifth Avenue New York 11, N. Y.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Handbook of Bossism

The Big Bosses, by Charles Van Devander. New York: Howell, Soskin and Company. 318 pages. $2.50.

HERE is "The Shame of the Cities" brought up to date. Mr. Van Devander is no Lincoln Steffens; his book is, nevertheless, a first rate over-all report to the nation on America's great political machines and the men who run them.

The local political boss and the spoils system which he generates, while undeniably part and parcel of the American political scene, are contradictory to the concept of a free people. Viscount Bryce, discussing in his "American Commonwealth" the organization of political rings and bosses, raised this question: "Must it be set down to democracy?" And he answered: "To some extent, yes," and added, "It could not have grown up save in a popular government."

Students of democracy have frequently puzzled over the fact that a "boss system" could flourish among a free people. Why does a sovereign people tolerate such a system? Mr. Van Devander contributes little or nothing to a possible answer. He accepts the fact and concerns himself with the realities. His is a factual story of machine politics, with emphasis on the part that will be played by the machines in the coming election. His conclusion is that as long as the bosses (Hague of Jersey City; Crump of Memphis; Kelly of Chicago; Jaeckle of Buffalo, etc.) "control important portions of the political organizations of their respective parties, it may be taken for granted that the candidates of both parties for all offices, up to and including that of President, will seek their support and will offer suitable rewards in the way of spoils after they are elected."

Mr. Van Devander, head of the Washington Bureau of The New York Post, is a shrewd political observer and his book is eminently worth reading. It is not, however, completely satisfying. It suffers, I think, from too much compression. One gets the idea that Mr. Van Devander would like to expand his material but was overly conscious of the paper shortage. As a consequence the book is top-heavy. It is a fairly full record of what our current crop of political bosses have done. But it is rather skimpy when it comes to telling *how* they have done it. If Mr. Van Devander will give us a sequel filling up the gaps he can cheerfully be forgiven the present omissions.

WILLARD WIENER

THE CHIMERA

PUBLISHED QUARTERLY

265 West 11th Street • New York 14, N. Y.

Contributors include:

W. H. Auden	Horace Gregory
John Berryman	Randall Jarrell
R. P. Blackmur	Kenneth Patchen
John Malcolm Brinnin	Karl Shapiro
Kenneth Burke	Wallace Stevens
Alex Comfort	Allen Tate
Babette Deutsch	William Troy
Richard Eberhart	Mark Van Doren
Wallace Fowlie	Philip Wheelwright

WINTER-SPRING 1944

WILLIAM TROY:
The New Parnassianism and Recent Poetry

JEAN WAHL: On Poetry

BRINNIN • EBERHART • HOWES
NERUDA • MOSS

Two dollars the four issues

The Men Who Make Rubber

The Rubber Workers, by Harold S. Roberts. New York: Harper and Brothers. 441 pages. $4.

THE LABOR MOVEMENT has been growing up, and so has the literature about it. There wasn't much to write about the puny union of rubber workers that was whipped in Trenton, New Jersey, in 1904, except to note that the AFL suspended it two years later for not paying its per-capita dues. Nor could a book be written about the terrible trouncing the Akron, Ohio, rubber workers got in 1913 (the IWW led the six-week strike), except to record the gloomy fact that the ruthless smashing of the rubber workers' union in 1913 bought the rubber barons twenty years of freedom from unions and collective bargaining—a generation of industrial peace at what a cost to the workers, their wives and kids!

Three decades later, though, the rubber workers and their union rate a first-class book, four-fifths of which is devoted to the 1933-43 decade. Harold Roberts has not written one of those fleeting labor surveys or a ponderous, unreadable treatise. He has produced a definitive economic work, heavy with footnotes, but definitely readable, with helpful chapter introductions and summaries. He skillfully combines in this volume a popular book with a thoroughly documented research work, and gives you the economic story (as distinct from the human one) of the men and women who make rubber (180,000) and the citations, too, if you want them.

It seems so long ago, yet it has only been ten years since the AFL, as in steel and automobiles, missed the boat in organizing the rubber workers under the NIRA Blue Eagle (1933-34). The Goodyear Tire and Rubber personnel director could write in April, 1935, "We have every reason to hope that the union movement in Akron may completely disintegrate." But the birth of the CIO a half-year later killed the rubber barons' hope for another 1913. For the last five weeks of the 1935-36 winter the Akron Goodyear workers, led by the CIO, stood on the picket line defying their hitherto undefeated employer until March 21, 1936, when they brought him to terms.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

They won a victory that was to open the door to still more victories and to a series of sit-down strikes in the latter part of the thirties that today make almost unbelievable reading. Yet the rubber workers grew so solidly (150,000 members) that they have been able to keep the industrial peace in their vital industry during the war, despite some pretty stubborn policies and practices of the rubber companies since Pearl Harbor.

The best chapter is the 60-page account of the 50-month-long negotiations between Goodyear and the United Rubber Workers (CIO) for a union contract—a veritable collective-bargaining marathon that ended on October 28, 1941. The arrogance and cunning of a large industrial employer and the persistence and inexperience (often the stupidity) of a struggling new union combine to make a most revealing piece of industrial-relations history. And there is more, for this is a complete book. The summary of all proceedings before the National Labor Relations Board affecting the rubber industry from July, 1935, to June, 1942, is the best job of this kind that I have seen for any industry. Roberts' discussion of collective bargaining in practice, and of some pressing problems confronting the rubber workers, now and in the postwar period, rounds out the story, plus a concluding chapter, "Beyond the Horizon." I have searched this book diligently for something to be critical about, and it isn't there. "The Rubber Workers," in a couple of nights' reading, gives you five years of an able young man's work.

I recommend this book heartily to my liberal friends outside of the labor movement, for it will give them an appreciation of the problems confronting the organized industrial workers. The mere fact that they have a union does not *per se* put them on easy street. They still have the hard, grinding fight of getting enough of the industrial pie to keep body and soul together. Perhaps a thorough reading of this book will dispel the hesitation that labor's friends may have about the necessity for seeking higher wages during the war. At any rate, it will give the reader an insight into what it is to be a rubber worker, and what it takes for his union and his fellow workers to obtain a modicum of justice from America's industrial society.

HAROLD J. RUTTENBERG

A Reader's List

ARE YOU READY FOR WORLD WAR III? by Waverly Root (Committee for a Democratic Foreign Policy, five cents). The need for a simply written evaluation of our foreign policy is admirably filled by this broadsheet. Designed for mass circulation and written in a terse, direct style, it shows the reader what is lacking in the official conduct of foreign affairs. The approach is a personal one: the housewife is asked if it makes no difference to her whether de Gaulle or Giraud leads the French, the business man is asked if he will want the Junkers as partners after the war, the soldier is asked if he would support Badoglio. The essential purpose of this war will have been lost irretrievably, we are told, if we permit our present policy to continue. And ours will be the sole responsibility for that failure.

PLANNING NO. 219: FACTS ABOUT INTERNATIONAL TRADE (Political and Economic Planning, available through The New Republic, 25 cents). It was seven years ago that PEP last reported on the main currents in international trade. The editors now review the latest developments. The reader is given an admirably succinct account of changes in the volume of trade, bilateral and multilateral techniques and wartime controls. While favorably disposed toward Hull's reciprocal-trade pacts, the editors have nothing but harsh words for the Ottawa empire agreements. They warn that such restrictive measures must be abandoned after the war or we shall fail to achieve a free movement of goods in world trade. The essential point of this well documented broadsheet—that a nation cannot hope to sell to others when it refuses to buy—demands frequent reiteration. So much of international economic bickering may be traced to the neo-mercantile fear of foreign goods. We are reminded,

THE THEATRE GUILD presents (in association with Jack H. Skirball)
JACOBOWSKY and the COLONEL
The FRANZ WERFEL - S. N. BEHRMAN COMEDY — Staged by ELIA KAZAN
LOUIS CALHERN—ANNABELLA—OSCAR KARLWEIS
J. EDWARD BROMBERG
MARTIN BECK THEATRE — 45th St., West of 8th Avenue
Evgs. at 8:30. Mats. Thurs. & Sat. 2:30

MICHAEL TODD presents
BOBBY CLARK in
MEXICAN HAYRIDE
by HERBERT & DOROTHY FIELDS • Staged by HASSARD SHORT
SONGS BY COLE PORTER
WINTER GARDEN, B'way & 50th St. Mats. Wed. & Sat.

"BUFFALO BILL"
in TECHNICOLOR—a 20th Century-Fox Picture
—: Plus a Town-Topping Stage Show :—
PAUL WHITEMAN & Orchestra (All-Gershwin Program)
VICTOR BORGE • JOAN EDWARDS
BUY MORE BONDS ROXY 7th Avenue at 50th Street

New Republic readers are cordially invited to
Farewell Luncheon to
HON. WALTER NASH
New Zealand Minister to the United States
President I.L.O. Conference (1944)
to be held at
HOTEL COMMODORE
Lexington Ave. and 42nd St., N.Y.C.—May 13, 1944, 12:30 O'clock
JUDGE THURMAN ARNOLD, Presiding
Mayor Fiorello H. LaGuardia with greetings from the City
Order Tickets, $3.00 immediately from
League for Industrial Democracy, 112 E. 19th St., N.Y.C.
On Same Day: Same Place
10:00-12:30—FULL EMPLOYMENT AND THE POST WAR
Speakers: Emil Rieve, John L. Childs, Stuart Chase (probably), Charles Abrams
3:15- 5:00—INTERNATIONAL CARTELS AND A PROGRAM FOR WORLD PEACE
Speakers: Thurman Arnold, J. King Gordon, Norman Thomas
Fee: 50c each session

POSTAGE FREE
Books of all publishers promptly mailed anywhere in the U.S.A.
NEW REPUBLIC BOOKS
40 E. 49th St., New York, N. Y.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

however, that the tide of world trade is largely governed by a preceding condition—full employment. In the final analysis, the editors argue, we need a policy that will ensure the greatest use of men and machines.

THE LAUGHTER OF MY FATHER, by Carlos Bulosan (Harcourt, Brace, $2). These aren't "serious" short stories, but they are probably the funniest collection that has come out in a long time. They're all about the Bulosan family, including the author, who lived on the island of Luzon in the Philippines. "We live but once"—a phrase in the title story—seems to be the philosophy dictating the lives of these islanders, and although most of the stories have to do with escapades of the lovable old father, every facet of peasant life is represented: love potions, weddings, churchgoing, courts, gamecock fighting—all of which adds up to about two hours of fun. "Father Goes to Court" and "Father Goes to Church" are two of the most amusing stories.

Crime and Punishment

AND THE DEEP BLUE SEA, by Raymond Knotts (Farrar and Rinehart, $2). Miami before the war is the setting of this fast-paced yarn. Who kidnaped Judie, only daughter of millionaire Breckenridge Polk? Who committed the three murders that followed her disappearance? Hale, the Chicago newspaperman who is visiting the Polks, neatly unravels the complicated but credible tangle. A well written and straightforward whodunit.

THE VISITOR, by Carl Randau and Leane Zugsmith (Random, $2). Bud Owen disappeared when he was fourteen and for three years his distraught mother and his stepfather are unable to get any trace of him. Suddenly he turns up, but is he really Bud? The authors have skillfully developed this provocative situation in an engrossing tale that profits by good writing and sound motivation. An intelligent job.

Contributors

Louis H. Bean, formerly an economist with the United States Department of Agriculture, is now with the Bureau of the Budget. In 1940 he published a statistical analysis of Ballot Behavior in Presidential Elections. "What Republican Trend?" is a continuation of that study.

Alexander L. Crosby is editor of Public Housing, a journal of the National Housing Conference. In the 1920's he worked as a laborer for California contractors who were building substandard bungalows. Since then he has been a newspaperman in the New York area.

Susan B. Anthony II is a *magna cum laude* graduate from the College for Women, University of Rochester, and has an M.A. from the American University. Her book, "Out of the Kitchen—Into the War," was published last fall by Stephen Daye, Inc., and is a report on what women are doing in the war and what should be done to permit fuller mobilization and utilization of womanpower. Miss Anthony has published articles in Modern Industry, the New York Times Magazine, the Christian Science Monitor Magazine, and for a year was a reporter on The Washington Star.

J. Donald Kingsley, professor of Government at Antioch College, is editor of The Antioch Review. He is co-author, with David W. Petegorsky, of "Strategy for Democracy." A new book, "Representative Bureaucracy," is to be published this month.

Eric F. Goldman, author of "John Bach McMaster, American Historian" and "Charles J. Bonaparte, Patrician Reformer," is a contributing editor of Time magazine.

Nicola Chiaromonte, a political refugee from Italy, is now living in New York. He left Italy in 1934 and lived in France until 1941, where he was connected with the Giustizia e Libertá group.

Willard Wiener was formerly on the staffs of The New York Post and PM. He is the author of "Rafferty" and "Morning in America" and a novel, "Four Boys and a Gun," published this month by Dial Press.

Harold J. Ruttenberg is the Research Director of the United Steelworkers of America and co-author, with Clinton S. Golden, of "The Dynamics of Industrial Democracy."

AWARD

FOR DISTINGUISHED SERVICE TO LABOR'S RIGHTS
TO
A. PHILIP RANDOLPH
President Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters
THIRD ANNUAL CLENDENIN AWARD *will be presented to Mr. Randolph at a*
Concert-Forum TUESDAY, MAY 2 — 8 P. M.
CARNEGIE HALL
PROGRAM:
Hon. NEWBOLD MORRIS, Presiding
Sen. Robert F. Wagner • Harry Hershfield • Willard S. Townsend
Roy Wilkins • David Dubinsky • Mary McLeod Bethune
Maynard C. Krueger • Max Delson • Frank Fenton
GEORGE S. COUNTS, Chairman, Committee of Sponsors
Presentation by LAURENCE T. HOSIE • Acceptance Speech by A. PHILIP RANDOLPH
ENTERTAINMENT:
DUKE ELLINGTON • MAURICE ROCCO • EARL HINES
BETTY GARRETT • MICKEY ALPERT, and others.
TICKETS — 60¢, $1.20, $2.40, $3.60 • Box Seats $5
Auspices: WORKERS DEFENSE LEAGUE, 112 E. 19th St., AL 4-4954.
Tickets also at Room 604, 9 Rockefeller Pl., CO 5-7460; Brotherhood Sleeping Car Porters, 217 W. 125th St.; Carnegie Hall, 57th St., 7th Ave.; Rand Bk. Store, 7 E. 15th St.; Call Bk. Svc., 303 4th Ave., and MOW Bk. Svc., 2084—7th Ave.
PROCEEDS TO BE USED FOR EDUCATION TO IMROVE RACE RELATIONS

HOW TO LIVE IN THE COUNTRY
With More Pleasure and Profit!
Anybody who loves or lives in or wants to live in the country will be enthusiastic about the COUNTRY BOOK. For here is an utterly different 128 page "digest of country living" which brings you the newest, practical information, hints and suggestions...selected from *hundreds of rural publications—condensed* for easy reading — plus the best original articles by leading authorities to be found anywhere. Copiously illustrated. Comes out four times a year with each season. Send one dollar now for a year's subscription to COUNTRY BOOK, 40 E. 49th Street, New York 17, N. Y. Dept. N.1.

LANGUAGES
PHONOGRAPH RECORD COURSES. All Makes. Booklet R. LANGUAGE SERVICE, 18 East 41st St., New York City 17, N. Y.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED